

Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, MAY 29, 1880.

CONTENTS.

CURRENT TOPICS:—	
The Leases Bill.....	567
The Rules of the Supreme Court	567
What is Legal Time?	567
Marriage Settlement Costs	567
The Government Employers' Liability Bill	568
LEADERS:—	
Rules of the Stock Exchange and the Law of Bankruptcy ..	569
Recent Decisions on Disclaimer by Trustee in Bankruptcy ..	570
RECENT DECISIONS	570
REVIEWS	571
GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE	571
CASES OF THE WEEK:—	
Yeatman v. Snow	572
Brown v. Rutherford	572
Dodson v. Martin	572
Johnson v. Egan	572
SOCIETIES	573
LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL	573
OBITUARY	574
APPOINTMENTS	574
COMPANIES	575
CREDITORS' CLAIMS	575
LEGISLATION OF THE WEEK	576
COURT PAPERS	576
LEGAL NEWS	580
LONDON GAZETTES &c., &c.	581

CASES REPORTED IN THE WEEKLY REPORTER.

Attorney-General, The, v. Wareing (Ch.Div. V.C.B.).....	623
Baker v. Baker, Wheeler, & Owen (Div.Div.)	630
"Consent," The (App.)	632
Kinloch v. Secretary of State for India in Council (App.) ..	619
Metropolitan District Railway Company, The, v. Sharpe (H.L.)	617
Middleton and others v. Simpson (C.P.Div.)	629
Roussillon v. Roussillon (Ch.Div. Fry, J.)	623
Swaine v. Denby (Ch.Div. V.C.B.)	623
Taylor v. McKeand & Co. (C.P.Div.)	628
Wadsworth v. Pickles (Q.B.Div.)	628
Watson, Ex parte, In re J. B. Walker & Co (Bkcy.)	632

CURRENT TOPICS.

MR. MARTEN'S Leases Bill of last session has been re-introduced in a somewhat altered form by Mr. Warton. It is now proposed to be provided that no proviso for re-entry for breach of any covenant in any lease shall be enforced, except with the consent and by the order of the High Court of Justice, to be obtained on application made by claim or defence in any action, or by motion in a summary manner. Upon such application the court may refuse to give effect to such proviso, and may relieve against the forfeiture, either absolutely or upon terms as to making good the breach of covenant or payment of compensation, &c. We fail to see that the addition to the original clause is an improvement. It does not appear that the tenant is to be served with notice of the motion by the landlord for an order to enforce the forfeiture, and the notion of throwing the *onus* of applying to the court and of justifying his re-entry on the landlord is very unfair. The proper provision is that adopted by Lord Cairns—viz., that the landlord should not re-enter until after due notice to the tenant, requiring him to remedy the breach—a provision which would, in many instances, lead to a settlement of the questions in dispute—but that in case the dispute be not so terminated, and the landlord proceeds, by action or otherwise, to enforce his right of re-entry, the lessee should have the right to apply for relief to the court, which relief the court may refuse or grant upon terms.

AS A MATTER OF CURIOSITY, it would be interesting to know why, among other peculiarities in the publication of Rules of the Supreme Court, some have

the signatures of the judges who make them printed at the foot, and others have not. Some are preceded by the order of the Lord Chancellor made periodically under the 17th section of "The Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876," and in some cases this order is omitted. For example, all the Rules of the Supreme Court up to those of March 22, 1879, were preceded by the then current order of the Lord Chancellor, and bore the signatures of the several judges making them; the rules of March 22, 1879, though preceded by the order, had no names of judges printed at the foot. The Rules of December, 1879, were issued in a similar form, but those of April, 1880, showed neither the authority to make the rules, nor the names of the judges making them. In May, 1880, the Rules are issued without the authority to make them being shown, but with an array of eight judges' names at the foot. It is not particularly important that all the details relating to the questions of who made the rules and by what authority should be set forth, but want of uniform practice in such a matter is to be deprecated as likely to lead to questions which, without reference to the original signed documents, would be hard to solve. It may be suggested that the last mode employed is the best, and that the signatures of the judges being appended, they may be presumed to have acted under proper authority.

A CURIOUS DISCUSSION has been raised as to legal time. It may be material for many purposes to ascertain the correct hour at which an event happened or at which a poll is to be closed. How is this to be ascertained—by Greenwich or by mean time? In *Curtis v. Marsh* (28 L. J. Ex. 36), the facts were that Mr. Baron Watson came into court at Rochester precisely at ten o'clock as it appeared by the clock at the Town Hall; but this clock was regulated by Greenwich time, and was several minutes faster than the clock outside the hall, and other clocks in the town. No one appearing for the defendant in an action (an ejectment which stood first on the list), the plaintiff's counsel took a verdict for the plaintiff. Afterwards the defendant's counsel appeared and said he was in time according to the clocks in the town. The judge pressed the plaintiff's counsel to consent that the cause should be tried, but the plaintiff's attorney would not consent unless the defendant would find security for costs, which he was unable to do, and the verdict stood. Upon a rule to set aside the verdict, Pollock, C.B., said that the time a court ought to go by is the time of the town in which the court sits, and not Greenwich time; the true time is the "mean time" at that place, and not Greenwich time. This opinion might be convenient at the time it was uttered, but in this, as in other respects, a good many things have happened since. As a correspondent of the *Times* points out, all our clocks now keep Greenwich time. No person knows any other time, and common sense seems to say now that that is the most convenient time to keep.

UPON THE QUESTION raised by our correspondents last week as to liability for marriage settlement costs, the case of *Helps v. Clayton and wife* (13 W. R. 161) is in point. It was there held by the Court of Common Pleas that "the retainer is to be considered as that of the lady or her parent, as the case may be, but usage makes the husband liable to indemnify whoever, on the part of the wife, has properly incurred expense by retaining the solicitor to prepare a settlement, in the preparing of which the latter has so large an interest." It was in this case that the late Mr. Cookson, to whom the question whether a marriage settlement of personality should be prepared by the solicitor of the husband or of the wife, decided that the practice in the profession was that the lady's solicitor should draw the settlements; and, he added, the gentlemen has the privilege

of paying for them. A very little consideration will show the origin and reason of the rule. All marriage settlements were originally, and most of them are still, entered into for the protection of the wife, who, without this protection, would, at least until the passing of the Act of 1870, not only have been deprived of all her own personal property by the marriage, but left without any provision out of her husband's property, except such as he might chance voluntarily to make for her. It is true that, down to 1834, her right of dower was, where the husband was seised of real estate, of considerable value, but it was not of a nature to be easily available for a provision even in the event of widowhood, and it had no existence at all during the coverture. This being so, the general principle that every grant ought to be prepared by or on behalf of the grantee, whose interest it is that it should be valid and effectual, and approved by or for the grantor, who is only concerned to see that it does not go beyond the contract, applied to this case, and as the benefit of the settlement accrued to the wife, she was the proper person to give instructions for its preparation, and the duty of preparing it accordingly devolved on her solicitor. But when the costs came to be paid, she was a married woman, and therefore, as the law then stood, not only not liable to be sued, but having a husband liable for all her debts, as well pre-nuptial as others; the husband therefore was legally bound to pay these costs, at any rate whenever the wife was herself the client of the solicitor to whom they were due; and as it was clearly the interest of this solicitor to get payment from the husband—who was ordinarily a stranger to him—rather than from the wife's father, who would generally be his own client, the course adopted was to treat the instructions as coming from the lady herself, and in that form to send in the bill of costs to the husband or his solicitor. This practice the Court of Common Pleas in the case above referred to treated as a usage binding the husband to indemnify anyone who on behalf of the wife has retained a solicitor to prepare the marriage settlement. We apprehend that the late changes in the law as to the husband's liability for his wife's pre-nuptial debts, however much they bear upon the reason for the usage, do not effect the decision based upon that usage; and that, at all events, until the doctrine of *Helps v. Clayton* has been considered by the Court of Appeal, the husband must pay the costs.

THE BILL on the subject of Employers' Liability, which has been introduced by the Government, is now printed. It proposes to make the employer responsible, first, where the injury to the servant is occasioned by reason of defective works, machinery, plant, or stock connected with the employer's business. Secondly, where the injury is due to the negligence of any person in the employer's service who has superintendence intrusted to him. Thirdly, where the negligence is on the part of any person in the employer's service to whose orders or directions the workman is bound to conform; and, fourthly, where the injury arises from the act or omission of any person in the employer's service done or made in obedience to the employer's rules or bye-laws, or in obedience to instructions given by any person delegated with the employer's authority on that behalf. It seems to us that the principle of the second head above referred to may perhaps be admitted. If a person in the position of a vice-master or foreman is negligent, we think it may perhaps be right that the master should suffer, though even here great difficulty arises. The idea often put forward is that the servant dare not complain of a person who is in authority, and if the master puts a person in such a position he must take the consequence of such a delegation of authority, otherwise the workman is in a cleft stick, and has no redress. There is a very dangerous doctrine really involved in this. Take this case. The workman knows that the superintending person is guilty of some negli-

gence which may work extensive mischief at any moment and involve the employer in ruinous liability. He says nothing about it; he dare not, for fear of losing his place, inform the employer. The mischief results. We think it is unjust that the employer should have to compensate that workman or his family if he is killed or injured. The man may be a fit subject for pity and excuse, but we think that no one but a person whose mind is thoroughly warped by class feeling could doubt as to the justice of the case. It will be said that this case would be covered by the provision of the Bill that exempts from its operation cases where the workman injured materially contributes by his own negligence to the cause of his injury. We doubt this very much. This, however, is a matter of detail. We think on the whole that, if duly limited, some such provision as that contemplated by this second head must be accepted. It seems now inevitable from the course discussion on the subject has taken. With regard to the first head above-mentioned—viz., where the injury is occasioned by defective works, &c., we entertain doubts. So far as the works are defective through the negligence of the master himself, the present law seems sufficient; so far as they are so through the negligence of a superintendent *employé*, the second head seems to cover the first. We doubt whether anything further than this ought to be included. The machinery may be defective through the negligence of an ordinary *co-employé*. Suppose a fellow-miner allows his Davy lamp to get out of order under circumstances involving no negligence on the part of the overlooker, is the master to be responsible for the results of an explosion? The third head seems to us rather doubtful, but we suppose the same principle is involved as in the case of the second head. The notion is that the vice-master's negligence is to be that of the master. The fourth head divides itself into two branches. The first is where the injury arises from the act or omission of any person in the employer's service done or made in obedience to the employer's rules or bye-laws. We do not like this phraseology. If the act is done or omitted by the employer's direction, we should think the present law sufficiently meets the case, assuming that the act is one the doing or omitting of which, on the part of the employer himself, would be negligent. But we can see all sorts of difficulties arising from the language used. The act may be one which would give no cause of action against the employer himself, and yet, apparently, according to the words, if it can be said to be the cause of the injury, the employer is to be liable. The second branch of this head seems to depend on the same principle as the second and third heads. We expect that these provisions, if the Bill becomes law, will give abundant opportunity to the courts for the exercise of their powers of interpretation. We only hope that they will not be found to do much mischief by subjecting various branches of industry to intolerable conditions.

It appears from the Blue Book containing "Statement and Abstracts of Reports deposited with the Board of Trade under the Act of 1870, for the year 1878" that twenty-eight British insurance companies paid away for commission alone the sum of £934,270, or more than one-seventh of the whole amount of premiums for fire insurances.

The Report of the Select Committee on Parliamentary Oaths, which was presented on the 20th inst., was to the effect that, in the opinion of the committee, persons entitled under the provisions of the Law of Evidence Amendment Act, 1869, and the Law of Evidence Amendment Act, 1870, to make a solemn declaration instead of an oath in courts of justice, cannot be admitted to make an affirmation or declaration instead of an oath in the House of Commons, in pursuance of the provisions of the Act of the 29 & 30 Vict. c. 19, and of the 31 & 32 Vict. c. 72.

THE RULES OF THE STOCK EXCHANGE AND THE LAW OF BANKRUPTCY.

THE case of *Ex parte Grant, Re Plumbly*, L. R. 13 Ch. D. 667, raised a point of difficulty and importance with regard to the rules of the Stock Exchange and the law of bankruptcy. The Court of Appeal, it is true, do not seem to have found much difficulty in deciding the case, but even admitting the law to be clear—which we do not feel quite so sure about—we cannot help feeling that practically the result is difficult to reconcile with the spirit of the law of bankruptcy.

The decision was as follows:—By the rules of the Stock Exchange, when a member is declared a defaulter, the contracts for the sale and purchase of stocks and shares, which have been made by him for the next settling or account day, are closed, by a person called the official assignee appointed by the Stock Exchange, at the market prices of the stocks and shares the subject of the contracts at the time of the default; and those members who, on that footing, owe differences on their contracts with the defaulter are bound by the rules, on pain of being declared defaulters, to pay those differences to the official assignee. The official assignee is bound by the rules to employ the moneys so received by him in the first place in paying to those members to whom, upon the same footing, differences are due upon their contracts with the defaulter the differences so due to them. In the case in question a trustee in bankruptcy of a defaulting member of the Stock Exchange sued for the moneys received by the official assignee under the above rules as part of the estate of the bankrupt. It was held that the action would not lie, on the ground that the fund created as above in the hands of the official assignee did not form part of the estate of the bankrupt.

The argument of Mr. Herschell, Q.C., for the official assignee, the substance of which received the assent of the court, was as follows:—He argued that there was no privity between the official assignee and trustee which entitled the latter to say that the former received the money to his use. We cannot think that this in equity much matters if the fund had been properly part of the bankrupt's estate; but it was said that the fund did not represent any part of the bankrupt's estate. It consisted of differences which might never have become payable to the bankrupt himself. The settlement upon a default takes place at prices which may be altogether different from those prevailing upon the settling day fixed by the contracts. The fund was an artificial fund, which came into existence only by virtue of the rules of the Stock Exchange on the default of the debtor. The trustee was claiming the benefit of the rules of the Stock Exchange so far as they created the fund, while he asserted that he was not bound by them so far as they regulated its distribution. It was urged that if the trustee had any remedy at all it was against the persons who had wrongly paid the assignee, and who, on that supposition, remained liable. We are free to admit that this argument seems very cogent, but the result is that certain of the bankrupt's creditors—viz., the Stock Exchange creditors—may, in the result, get a great advantage over the other creditors, which seems contrary to the spirit of the bankruptcy laws. A fund which is derived from the contracts in which the bankrupt is interested, and which contracts may be called part of his estate, is employed in the payment—perhaps in full—of a selected class of his liabilities. The fund may not be part of the estate, but it is derived from, and is, in fact, a metamorphosis of, a part of the estate.

Though not bearing on the above subject, we may notice the statements of an affidavit made in this case by some of the leading members of the Stock Exchange. They bear out some observations which we took occasion to make some short time back with regard to some of the confusions of idea that have prevailed in the courts with regard to the nature of Stock Exchange

transactions. A great deal has been said about differences and gambling contracts and time-bargains in many of the Stock Exchange cases both to judges and to juries which, to anyone who had really mastered the Stock Exchange rules and practices, would appear obviously beside the mark and founded on misconception. The statements to which we allude in the affidavit are as follows:—"Contracts on the Stock Exchange are never for payment or receipt of differences. All contracts on the Stock Exchange are real transactions for cash or for a day named, contemplating and compelling the actual transfer or delivery, and the paying for the stock or shares the subject thereof, and which transfer, or delivery and payment, can only be avoided and rendered unnecessary by a new and equally real bargain, on the one part to accept and pay for on the same day, and on the other part to transfer or deliver, an equivalent amount of the same stock or shares." The affidavit then goes on in detail to show how this is, but we have not space for more. People seem to have thought that, because a person dealing on the Stock Exchange may buy or sell stocks which he never intends to take up or deliver, and his broker knows it, therefore there is a question of a contract void as a gambling or wagering contract, but sufficient distinction is not made between the contract as between the seller and the purchaser and as between the principal and agent. They must be dealt with separately. It is obvious on reflection that the contract must be good as between the principals. The fact that one principal means to deal with it otherwise than by actual delivery or receipt of the stuff is not within the knowledge of the other principal. As between the principal and agent it never was the law as to stock and shares in general, nor is it now the law as to any security, that the contract is illegal because they both contemplate gambling. If I make a bet at another's request and pay it upon loss of the wager, I can recover the amount so paid if he authorizes me to pay it, as money paid for my principal at his request.

There is no doubt that practically the Stock Exchange system of the novation of contracts does enormously facilitate gambling on the Stock Exchange, but then it also greatly facilitates legitimate transactions in public securities. We yield to none in our dislike of the gambling that goes on in the Stock Exchange; but the truth is that it is very difficult indeed to draw the line between what amounts to gambling, and what amounts to legitimate business. It is the old case of the wheat and the tares—anything that would prevent the one would, we fear, also hamper and damage the other. A market in which investments may be freely and conveniently made and disposed of is now a public necessity, and it would be unjust that those who wish to deal legitimately should be prejudiced by the restrictions intended to affect others.

Mr. G. R. Rogerson, of Liverpool, writing to the *Times* on the subject of re-sealing probates, says:—"Very recently clients of mine have had to bear both expense and delay consequent upon the necessity for re-sealing an English probate in Scotland. A testator domiciled in England held shares in a steamship company. The steamers all sail from this port, and most of the company's business is transacted here; but the company is registered in Scotland, and on this ground alone the executors were compelled at considerable expense to have the English probate re-sealed by the Scotch Court. The cost, however, is not the most serious part of the business. In England the registration of an English probate is usually effected in the course of a post at the expense of 5s., while in the case mentioned two agents, one in Glasgow and the other in Edinburgh, had to be employed and the formalities occupied several weeks, during which time the probate could not be registered in the books of the other companies in which the testator held shares, and of course the shares could not be dealt with meanwhile."

RECENT DECISIONS ON DISCLAIMER BY TRUSTEE IN BANKRUPTCY.

Two or three cases of considerable importance have recently been decided in the Common Law Divisions with regard to the subject of disclaimer of leasehold property by a trustee in bankruptcy. We propose, without going very deeply into the questions raised by these decisions, which would, perhaps, be beyond the compass of a short article, to place them in juxtaposition, and briefly to indicate the points decided.

The first of these decisions is *Reed v. Harvey* (28 W. R. 423, L. R. 5 Q. B. D. 184). It was there decided that the 28th rule of the Bankruptcy Rules, 1871, which provides that the trustee in bankruptcy shall not execute a disclaimer of leasehold property without the leave of the court, does not mean that the disclaimer, if executed without such leave, shall be ineffectual, but merely that, as between the trustee and the court, it shall be the duty of the trustee to obtain such leave before disclaiming. We feel little doubt that this decision is right. The rule cannot modify, in this respect, the express provision of the Act itself, but the result might be somewhat strange. In *Reed v. Harvey*, the trustee disclaimed without the leave of the court, and it was held that this exonerated him from rent as though the lease had been surrendered at the time of the bankruptcy. Suppose the trustee had applied for and failed to obtain leave to disclaim? It would appear that, subject to any consequences that might follow by way of penalty upon him, he could nevertheless effectually disclaim. Of course, it would seldom happen that a trustee would venture to disclaim under such circumstances, but it does not seem to us that the state of the law in this respect is altogether satisfactory. It would be better, we should think, that the validity of the disclaimer should depend on an application to the court, with notice to all parties interested. It is curious to observe that this point might have arisen in the case, on which we commented last week, of *Wilson v. Wallani* (28 W. R. 597, L. R. 5 Ex. D. 155). There appears in that case to have been a disclaimer, but the parties supposed it to be ineffectual without the leave of the court, and a subsequent application for leave proved unsuccessful. It ultimately turned out that the disclaimer was a nullity as not being duly executed, quite apart from the absence of leave.

The next case to which we shall refer is *Lowrey v. Barker* (28 W. R. 559, L. R. 5 Ex. D. 170.). In this case various somewhat nice questions were mooted as to the position of a trustee in bankruptcy with regard to acts done by him between the time when the estate vested in him and a disclaimer of the lease. The trustee in this case retained the key of the premises for a certain period without actually using them, and then disclaimed them. It was argued that for the time of his actual retention of possession, previous to the disclaimer, he was either liable on an implied agreement to pay upon a *quantum meruit* for the occupation, or to pay damages as a trespasser. The court, however, held otherwise. They relied on the words of the statute which say that upon disclaimer the premises shall be deemed to have been surrendered from the date of the adjudication. The landlord, they said, might have protected himself by calling on the trustee to elect whether he would disclaim or not, under section 24 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869. Bramwell, L.J., put the whole case in a few words. "It seems to me impossible to hold that a power of disclaimer, given for the benefit of the estate, can only be exercised on the terms of its trustee becoming a wrongdoer and a trespasser; nor can it be possible to imply a contract to pay for the occupation on a *quantum meruit* in respect of an occupation which, had there been no disclaimer, would have been as assignee of the lease."

It is a question, however, whether this case goes further than holding that where the trustee has merely retained possession while he determined whether to disclaim or not

but has not used the premises beneficially to the estate; upon disclaimer is free from liability. Thesiger, L.J., in whose judgment Cockburn, C.J., concurred, says, "I desire to guard myself against being supposed to lay down as a general principle that a trustee in bankruptcy who, after having had actual occupation of the bankrupt's leasehold premises without payment, disclaims the property, is under no personal liability. It seems manifestly unjust that the landlord should be remitted to proof in bankruptcy, and should thus be a sufferer over and above the other creditors of the bankrupt in respect of a damage to him, which, even under the powers given to him by section 24 of the Bankruptcy Act, he could not wholly prevent, and which is incurred after the bankruptcy, and for the benefit of the general body of the creditors. On the other hand there is no reason, as a matter of justice, why the bankrupt's estate should not be called upon to indemnify the trustee for what he is called upon to pay in respect of an occupation which he need not and would not have enjoyed except for the purpose of increasing that estate." It does seem very hard that in the case of a beneficial occupation by the trustee by which the estate is benefited, the landlord should be without remuneration, except by way of proof in bankruptcy, but it does seem very difficult to work out the legal relations of the parties so as to give any compensation to him, having regard to the provisions of the Act. It is difficult to imply a contract which clearly was not that under which the occupation took place, and, on the other hand, it seems still more difficult to look on the trustee as a trespasser. It would be a merely contingent contract or trespass at the time of its existence—a very unsatisfactory notion—and the words of the Act are strongly against such a mode of viewing the transaction. It seems to us that the difficulties dealt with by Thesiger, L.J., ought to be settled by express statutory provision, and we hope that in any future Bankruptcy Act this may be done.

Recent Decisions.

WAY OF NECESSITY.

(*Corporation of London v. Riggs*, M.R., 28 W. R. 610.)

An interesting point was decided in this case, apparently for the first time. Is the way of necessity implied in favour of a man who grants land entirely surrounding a close which he retains, a *general* right of way, or a right of way limited to the necessity at the time of the grant? In other words, if, at that time, the way is needed for agricultural purposes only, can it afterwards be used for carting materials for the erection of a house on the close retained? Looking at the matter on principle, it would seem that the right must be limited. The reason for allowing this exception to the rule that a man cannot derogate from his own grant is stated to be that otherwise the close retained would be useless; this result is obviated by implying a grant of a right of way for such purposes as are necessary at the time of the grant. This is the ground on which the Master of the Rolls decided that the right must be limited to these purposes, but we think a stronger reason might be found. Such a right may fairly be supposed to be in the contemplation of the purchaser of the surrounding land, but he can hardly be taken to anticipate all the uses to which the owner of the reserved close may desire at any future time to turn it. The purchaser may be willing to buy subject to a right of way for ascertained purposes, because he then knows the amount of detriment his land will sustain. A right to use the way for agricultural purposes only may be immaterial to him; not so a right of way which may at any time be enlarged to a right to bring over his land the building materials for a row of cottages, and a right of way for the occupants of the cottages and their children and friends

for ever. If the owner of the close retained meant to reserve such a right of way, he ought, in fairness to his purchaser, to have expressly stipulated for it.

As regards the case before the court, the decision of the Master of the Rolls seems to be unassailable, but the learned judge rather went out of his way to intimate an opinion that the same rule applies to the case where a man grants a close and retains the surrounding land. With submission, we doubt whether this is so. Surely the grantor must be taken to grant the use of the close for *all purposes*, and not merely for the purpose for which it is used at the time of the grant. If so, does not the rule against a man derogating from his grant apply to prevent him from practically restricting the use of the close to certain purposes, by denying a right of way for any other purposes? Considering that the purchaser of the close will certainly be under the impression that he can use his land for any purpose, is it not fair that if the vendor means to restrict the use of the land, by restricting the right of way to it, the *onus* should be thrown on him of doing so by express stipulation in the conveyance?

Reviews.

COUNTY COURT PRACTICE.

A COMPLETE PRACTICE OF THE COUNTY COURTS; INCLUDING THAT IN ADMIRALTY AND BANKRUPTCY, &c. By G. PITT-LEWIS, Barrister-at-Law, assisted by H. A. DE COLYAR, Barrister-at-Law. Two vols. Stevens & Sons.

This is by far the most elaborate treatise which has yet appeared on County Court Practice. It opens with a sketch of the history and constitution of the ancient county courts, to the jurisdiction and powers of which the courts held under the modern County Courts Acts have succeeded (9 & 10 Vict. c. 95, s. 3); and it ends with a treatise on the Jurisdiction and Practice in Bankruptcy. The amount of information given, and the variety of subjects treated of in the intervening chapters, can only be appreciated by a reference to the table of contents. The mode of execution of the work may be judged of by an examination of the chapter on Appeals (chapter 17, book 2)—a subject which, more than any other connected with county courts, needs elucidation. The chapter is divided into three sections. The first discusses the question when an appeal lies, and the second and third are devoted respectively to the modes of appeal by special case and by motion. Under the first section a general summary is first given of the law relating to appeals, and this is followed by the statement in detail of the enactments and cases governing the right to appeal. The section on Appeal by Special Case deals very fully and accurately with the subject, and in the subsequent section on Appeal by Motion, all the cases are noticed and discussed with care and intelligence. This is, as far as we have been able to ascertain, a fair specimen of the part of the book relating to the general jurisdiction and practice of the county courts. It is very clearly written and is always practical. In book 5 of volume 2 there is dealt with the most difficult, as regards satisfactory treatment, of all the branches of county court jurisdiction—the jurisdiction and proceedings under special statutes, and here we think the author has been remarkably successful. He deals, first of all, with the general practice in cases of special statutory jurisdiction, and then groups the statutes under five heads:—Statutes relating to penalties and forfeitures; special statutes to recover moneys other than penalties; statutes providing for the settlement of disputed matters; statutes conferring an administrative jurisdiction, and statutes relating to matters of public concern. The great difficulty in dealing with these Acts is to know how much of them to reprint. Mr. Pitt-Lewis has, we

think, overcome this difficulty, and has given so much of each statute, either in effect or in the words of the enactment, as explains the jurisdiction of the court. For instance, he prefaces his chapter on the Jurisdiction and Proceedings under the Charitable Trusts Acts by an outline of the constitution and powers of the Charity Commissioners—certainly an essential preliminary to comprehending the jurisdiction conferred by the Charitable Trusts Acts on the county court. The index is very elaborate, and there is an excellent tabular index to the County Courts Acts and Rules. The book appears to us to be characterized by intelligence in design and care in execution, and is likely to become the standard County Court Practice.

STAMPS.

A DIGEST OF THE STAMP DUTIES, AND OF THE JUDICIAL DECISIONS THEREON. With Notes. By GUALTER C. GRIFFITH, Barrister-at-Law, and of the Inland Revenue Department. EIGHTH EDITION. Vacher & Sons.

We have used Mr. Griffith's book for several years, and have found it of great value. In the present edition it appears in an enlarged form, containing abstracts of the Legacy and Succession Duty Acts, and considerable additions to the Notes. The new probate and administration duties are given, with the form of account now required. Looking through the Digest of Cases, we have found all the recent decisions which occurred to us, except *Fisher v. Calvert* (27 W. R. 301), which should have followed *Buck v. Robson* at p. 204. The book will be found a most conveniently arranged digest of the stamp laws.

LAW DICTIONARY.

A NEW LAW DICTIONARY AND INSTITUTE OF THE WHOLE LAW. By ARCHIBALD BROWN, Barrister-at-Law. SECOND EDITION. Stevens & Haynes.

Mr. Brown has revised his Dictionary and adapted it to the changes effected by the Judicature Acts, and it now constitutes a very useful work to put into the hands of any student or articulated clerk, and a work which the practitioner will find of value for reference. There are here and there headings which we should like to see enlarged—for instance, under Bills of Sale, some notice of the attestation by a solicitor should be given; but, on the whole, Mr. Brown has carried out very successfully his design of compressed statement and avoidance of iteration.

General Correspondence.

RULES OF APRIL, 1880.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—It may be of service to your readers to know that the Probate Court considers that ord. 37, r. 3c, does not apply to that Division, and that all affidavits, the *jurats* of which are in accordance with the above rule, will be rejected. The ground of the objection is that the Probate Division is not expressly named in the rules.

If the objection be well founded (which I doubt), surely there is no reason why the Probate Division should not adopt the form of *jurat* provided by the rule.

May 22, 1880.

J. H.

MARRIAGE SETTLEMENT COSTS.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—We would refer "X. & Co" to *Helps v. Clayton* (13 W. R. 161).

May 22, 1880.

D. & T.

Cases of the Week.

APPEAL—SECURITY FOR COSTS—SEPARATE APPEALS FROM DIFFERENT ORDERS IN SAME ACTION.—In a case of *Yeatman v. Snow*, before the Court of Appeal on the 25th inst., the defendants applied for an order that the plaintiff should give security for the costs of two appeals which he had presented from two orders in the action. The plaintiff had already been ordered by the court to deposit £15 as security for the costs of another appeal which he had presented from another order in the action. The plaintiff appeared in person, and urged that the three appeals ought to be heard together, and that the security which he had been ordered to give, and which he had since given, was sufficient for the costs of all the three appeals. And he stated that he had given three distinct notices of appeal because he had been told by the officer of the court that it was necessary to give a separate notice with respect to each order appealed from. Upon inquiry, it appeared that this advice had been given by one of the junior clerks of the registrar. **JESSEL, M.R.**, said that this was an entire mistake. Under the old practice, one petition of appeal might be presented from any number of orders in the same action, provided that the appeal was in time. And now, any number of orders between the same parties could be appealed from by one notice of appeal. And the court (**JESSEL, M.R.**, and **JAMES and COTTON, L.JJ.**) ordered that the three appeals should be consolidated and heard together, and that the £15 already deposited should be security for the costs of all three appeals. The costs of the motion for security were to be costs of the appeals.—**SOLICITORS, Bolton, Robbins, & Busk; Shakespear.**

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS—PROMISSORY NOTE PAYABLE THREE MONTHS AFTER DEMAND—PROOF OF DEMAND—PAYMENT OF INTEREST.—In a case of *Brown v. Rutherford*, before the Court of Appeal on the 25th inst., the question arose whether a debt claimed in an administration action was barred by the Statute of Limitations. The claim was made in respect of a promissory note which had been given by the testator. The note bore date the 20th of May, 1857, and was in these terms: "Three months after demand I promise to pay Mr. R. Rutherford the sum of £150 for value received." The testator died in 1869. The payee of the note died in 1878, and the claim to prove was made by his executor. The note had been found after the death of the payee among his papers by his executor. On it was the following indorsement:—

"Interest, 12th November, 1857, £3 15s.

Do. 12th May, 1858, £3 15s."

There was no evidence whether the note had been paid or not, but the testator's executor deposed that no demand for payment had been made upon him after the testator's death until, after the death of the payee, the claim was made in the action by his executor. The Statute of Limitations was relied upon as a defence to the claim. In answer to this, it was urged that the statute did not begin to run until a demand for payment was made, and that there was no evidence of any demand having been made before the action. The reply to this was that the payment of interest, as proved by the indorsements, was evidence that a demand for payment of the principal must have been made. **Hall, V.C.**, held that the payment of interest was not evidence of a demand, and that the lapse of time afforded no evidence of satisfaction of the note when it was found in the possession of the payee. And his lordship admitted the claim for £150, with interest for twenty years. The Court of Appeal (**JESSEL, M.R.**, and **JAMES and COTTON, L.JJ.**) reversed this decision. **JESSEL, M.R.**, said that the indorsements of payment of interest were evidence of a demand for payment of the principal having been made. The natural inference from the payment of interest was that it was paid for forbearance in demanding a debt which was due. His lordship thought that the indorsements were evidence against both the parties to the note, though, no doubt, there had been a mistake in making the interest run from the date of the note, instead of from the date of the demand. On this ground, therefore, the statute applied. But his lordship also thought that, considering the circumstances, and especially the lapse of time, it ought to be presumed that the note had been paid, independently of the

indorsements as to interest. It was not necessary to decide that point, but it must not be supposed that the mere production of a promissory note, payable on demand, twenty years old, would entitle the holder to payment of the amount. His lordship thought that the doctrine as to stale demands would apply. **JAMES, L.J.**, expressed his concurrence, and said that he thought the case could not be distinguished from *Bamfield v. Tupper* (7 Ex. 27).—**SOLICITORS, Shum, Crossman, & Co.; Henderson & Buckle.**

IMMORAL BOOK—INJUNCTION TO RESTRAIN INFRINGEMENT OF COPYRIGHT—RIGHT TO PROTECTION OF COURT.—In a case of *Dodson v. Martin*, before the Master of the Rolls on the 27th inst., a motion was made for an injunction to restrain the publication of a book, a copy of a book published by the plaintiff. The plaintiff's book was stated to be published with the object of exposing certain alleged improper directions in relation to confession in the Church of England, and contained numerous extracts from a book called, "A Guide to the Priesthood," published for private circulation amongst priests. **JESSEL, M.R.**, perused some of the extracts, and came to the conclusion that they were of an indecent or immoral character, if sold to be read by the public. The objection was not taken by the defendant that the book on that ground was not entitled to protection. **JESSEL, M.R.**, overruled certain other objections to the plaintiff's right to the injunction, and in granting the same, said that there were certainly many extracts in the book which were decidedly of an immoral character, and, although the book was published avowedly with the object of checking certain alleged tendencies to immorality, he was by no means sure they would effect that object. He felt by no means clear that he ought to extend the protection of the court to such a book as the plaintiff's; but, as the point was not taken on the other side, he did not think a judge ought, *mero motu*, to refuse to grant the injunction. He therefore made the order asked for.—**SOLICITORS, Macarthur & Son; N. Jourdain.**

COPYRIGHT—RESERVATION OF RIGHT OF REPRODUCTION IN VOLUME FORM—PRODUCTION OF SERIAL—CONFLICT OF EVIDENCE—INJUNCTION—BALANCE OF CONVENIENCE.—In a case of *Johnson v. Egan*, before the Master of the Rolls on the 26th inst., a question arose whether an infringement of copyright had been caused by the defendant under the following circumstances. It appeared that the defendant had sold the plaintiff the copyright in a novel, reserving to himself a liberty to reproduce the novel in "volume form." The novel had been published some years ago by the plaintiff in a weekly publication, and was now being republished by the defendant in a weekly form, the intention being that the novel when completed could be bound in a volume. The plaintiff moved for an injunction to restrain the defendant from publishing the book, and there was a conflict of evidence in the affidavits as to the meaning of the term "volume form" in the trade. **JESSEL, M.R.**, said that, having regard to the conflict of evidence, he did not consider the plaintiff's title was made out sufficiently satisfactorily to enable him to grant an interlocutory application. His impression, however certainly, on the affidavits, was that the defendant was right, on the ground, to a great extent, that his witnesses distinguished the two terms, publication in a "volume" and in a "volume form." He, moreover, did not see how the plaintiff would really be injured by allowing the publication until the trial the defendant could keep an account, and the plaintiff did not state in his affidavit that he had sold many of the back numbers containing the novel, although he no doubt said that certain back numbers had been sold. To his mind affidavits to be worth anything must be precise and not couched in general terms, and therefore he could not place much reliance on the alleged injury that would be done to the plaintiff. On the other hand, great injury might be done to the defendant. He also thought there had been some sort of acquiescence in the publication sufficient at all events to disentitle the plaintiff to an interlocutory injunction. He therefore refused the injunction and reserved the question of costs until the trial.—**SOLICITORS, Benham & Tindell; Allen & Son.**

Societies.

LAW ASSOCIATION.

At the annual general court held at the hall of the Incorporated Law Society, Chancery-lane, on Thursday, the 27th of May, the following being present, viz.:—Mr. L. Desborough (chairman), and Messrs. Boodle, Burgess, Parkin, Sytun, Collison, Smith, Steward, Giraud, Drew, Doyle, and others, and A. B. Carpenter (secretary), the directors' report and statement of accounts for the past year were read, and officers for the ensuing year were elected, and the ordinary general business was transacted.

The following is a copy of the report:—

The sixty-third report of the board of directors to the annual general board, Thursday, 27th of May, 1880, Laurence Desborough, Esq., in the chair:—

1. Your directors have the pleasure of submitting to the members of the association a report of their proceedings and the accounts for the last twelve months.

2. Your directors have considered thirty cases of the primary class, and have distributed amongst them the aggregate sum of £1,362 10s.

3. They have also considered numerous applications of the secondary or non-members' class, which have come before them, and they have distributed the sum of £150 placed at their disposal amongst nineteen cases.

4. Your directors recommend to the general court that a sum of £200 be placed at their disposal for the cases of non-members for the ensuing year.

5. Your directors have the pleasure to report that they have received towards the funds of the association two donations, one of £5 5s. from the principal and ancients of Staple-inn and one of £3 3s. from the late treasurer of the Middle Temple. They have also much pleasure in acknowledging the receipt of £484 7s. 6d., being the net proceeds of £500 consols which the executors of the late Miss Harriett Hurst had (under the advice of their solicitors, Messrs. Crasse, Sons, & Riley) granted to the association. This amount, with a small addition from their general balance, has enabled your directors to increase the holding in £3 per Cent. Reduced from £1,380 7s. 4d. to £2,000.

6. The several investments now belonging to the association are as follows, viz:—

New 3 per Cents.	£22,480 11 9
3 per Cent. Consols	£1,600 0 0
3 per Cent. Reduced	£2,000 0 0
India 4 per Cents.	£465 13 2
Great Indian Peninsular Railway Stock	£2,500 0 0
East Indian Railway Company: (Annuity Class B)	£6,837 10 0

The dividends received last year amounted to £1,353 11s. 1d.

7. There are now 251 annual subscribers, the amount received from whom for the past year has been £514 10s., which sum, added to the dividends received from the above investments, makes the income for the year £1,863 1s. 1d.

8. Your directors report with regret the deaths of six members during the past year, viz.:—Mr. E. F. Barton, Mr. Thomas Burgoyne, Mr. C. U. Price, Mr. R. B. Follett, Mr. H. S. Law, and Mr. George Carlisle. During the same period thirteen new members have joined the association, of whom two are life members, and eleven are annual subscribers.

9. The names of above 4,000 solicitors appear in the *Law List* for 1880, as practising within the metropolitan district (where the operations of the society are carried on), but there are only 400 members of the association. Your directors feel that it only needs a little personal effort on the part of individual members in explaining the objects of the association, and in inviting professional friends and neighbours to become subscribers, to obtain a large addition to the list of members, and thus enable the directors to comply with more of the numerous applications made to them for assistance.

10. By the regulations of the association, the president, vice-president, treasurers, directors, and auditors for the ensuing year are to be elected at the present meeting.

(By order of the board) A. B. CARPENTER, Sec.

Law Students' Journal.

INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

HONOURS EXAMINATION.—April, 1880.

At the examination for honours of candidates for admission on the roll of solicitors of the Supreme Court, the examination committee recommended the following gentlemen as being entitled to honorary distinction:—

FIRST CLASS. (In order of merit.)

1. George Francis Huggins, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Rowlands, Bagnall, & Co., of Birmingham.
2. John Oakden Swift, who served his clerkship to Mr. T. Swift, of St. Helen's, Lancashire.

SECOND CLASS. (In alphabetical order.)

- Arthur Belfield, who served his clerkship with Messrs. Tozer & Geare, of Exeter; and Messrs. Geare & Son, of Lincoln's-inn-fields.
- Ernest Bevir, who served his clerkship to Mr. R. Ellett, of Cirencester; Mr. H. Bevir, of Wootton Bassett; and Messrs. Peacock & Goddard, of London.
- John Burgess, who served his clerkship to Mr. W. Dampier Jeans, of Warrington; and Messrs. Field, Roscoe, & Co., of London.

Alfred C. Champney, who served his clerkship to Messrs. D. & A. H. Russell, of York; and Mr. G. W. Haines, of Gloucester.

William Postlethwaite, B.A., who served his clerkship to Messrs. Miller, Son, & Stevens, of Norwich.

Edwin Welsh, who served his clerkship to Mr. J. Welsh, of Wells, Somerset; and Messrs. Prior, Bigg, Church, & Adams, of London.

Sydney White, B.A., who served his clerkship to Messrs. Duncan, Warren, & Gardner, of London.

THIRD CLASS. (In Alphabetical Order.)

Henry Edward Donner, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Shirley, Atkinson, & Shirley, of Doncaster; and Messrs. A. F. & R. W. Tweedie, of London.

Ephraim Ellidge, who served his clerkship to Mr. J. Molesworth, of Rochdale.

Henry George Underwood Elliott, who served his clerkship to Messrs. Oldman & Iverson, of Gainsborough, and Mr. A. R. Oldman, of London.

William Henry Gater, B.A., who served his clerkship to Messrs. Wilson, Thring, & Wilson, of Salisbury; and Messrs. Taylor, Hoare, & Taylor, of London.

Raymond Guy Paze, who served his clerkship to Mr. J. Edell, of London.

William Guthrie Tully, who served his clerkship to Mr. S. Kewney, of North Shields.

Joseph James Whowell, who served his clerkship to Mr. James Grundy, of Bolton.

The council of the Incorporated Law Society have accordingly given class certificates, and awarded the following prizes of books:—

To Mr. Huggins, the prize of the Honourable Society of Clement's-inn, value 10 guineas.

To Mr. Swift, the prize of the Honourable Society of Clifford's-inn, value 5 guineas.

The council have given class certificates to the candidates in the second and third classes.

The number of candidates examined was forty.

(By order of the council)

E. W. WILLIAMSON, Secretary.

Law Society's Hall, Chancery-lane, London.

COUNCIL OF LEGAL EDUCATION.

TRINITY EXAMINATION, 1880.

GENERAL EXAMINATION OF STUDENTS of the INNS of COURT, held at Lincoln's-inn Hall, on the 7th, 8th, 10th, 11th, 12th, and 13th of May, 1880.

The Council of Legal Education have awarded to George Baird Burnham, of the Middle Temple, a studentship in jurisprudence and Roman law, of one hundred guineas, to continue for a period of two years; and to Alfred Crooke, of the Middle Temple, and Robert Forse McMillan, of the Inner Temple, studentships in jurisprudence and Roman law, of one hundred guineas, for one year.

The council have also awarded to William Ebenezer Grigby, of the Inner Temple, the Barstow Law Scholarship,

and to Joseph Gatey, of the Middle Temple, and William Ebenezer Grigsby, of the Inner Temple, certificates of honour of the second class.

The council have also awarded to the following students certificates that they have satisfactorily passed a public examination:—Henry Arden Adderley, Henry Milly Beevor, William Robert Bousfield, Wilfred Brinton, Edward Balcombe Brown, George Cave, Alfred Clayton Cole, Thomas Woodcock Denman, Arthur Havelock East, Charles Hardman Grafton, Hon. Herbert George Henry Hanbury-Tracy, Richard Williamson Harper, James Hay, William Hodgson Horsfall, Colin Jamieson, Francis Amboor Keating, Francis Palmer Kemp, Arthur McArthur Kingsmill, James Arthur Lees, Alfred Milner, Edward Fanecourt Mitchell, Nicholas Lower Palliologus, John Henry Peartree, Mervyn Lloyd Peel, Thomas Robert Redfern, Latham Gallup Reed, William Snowden Robson, Charles Harington Scafe, Harry Scarlett, Charles Read Seymour, William Edward Thompson Sharpe, Charles Combe Tennant, and Charles Oakley Walker, of the Inner Temple; William Redhead Edmund Barker, John Thomas Blazé, George Paris Bradshawe, Dolatray Surbhai Desai, Francis Cuthbert Fishbourne, Thomas Dale Hart, Henry William Forsyth Harwood-Harwood, William Augustus Hobson, John Watson Loxdale, Simon John Fraser Macleod, Alexander McMicking, Henry Charles Hannam Man, Michael John Michael, Frederick Hardyman Parker, Alfred Vanwaters-Choodt Lucie Smith, George Herbert Stutfield, Herbert William Trenchard, Harold Wright, and Samuel Wilberforce Hartley Wyke, of the Middle Temple; Henry Leopold Ashton, Edwin Foulkes Ball, John Frederick Bean, Richard Rideout Beard, Amaury Robert Macnamara Bouchier, John Henry Chapman, Frank Chesshire, Charles Arthur Close, Percy Dawson, Maurice Des Gréz, Reginald Fairbairn, Joshua Leslie Field, Thomas Oliver Harding, Charles Alexander Harris, John Duffus Harris, Henry Mather Jackson, Harry Johnson, Joseph John Talbot Lamb, Samuel Henry Leonard, Joseph Renner Maxwell, Francis Hamilton Mellor, William Ingham Shaw, Samuel Woodall Smith, William Pulteney Smith, George Abbott Streeten, George James Suckling, Henry Spencer Wilkinson, Thomas Wood, and George Burgess Lancaster Woodbourne, of Lincoln's-inn; and Frederick William Batchelor, Frank Dodd, and Charles Paget Moore, of Gray's-inn, Esq.

The following students passed a satisfactory examination in Roman law:—Ernest Henry Ainslie, James Henry T. Broadwood, William Martin Burn, George Anson Byron, George Herbert Caspron, George Cawston, Fredrick Francis Daldy, Frederic John Dryhurst, Frederick Brandstrom Fletcher, Arthur Addleshaw Hartley, Abraham Hebron, Charles Pelham Huggins, Frederick John Francis Wootton Isaacson, Edulgee Jamsatjee Khory, William Edward Lawson, Gilbert Metcalfe, James Dennistoun Mitchell, William Anthony Ryam Musgrave, John Linsion Nash, Cyril Francis Oliphant, Carl Pearson, Dudley David Pontifex, John Davenport Rogers, Martin John Sarkies, Henry John Stanyon, William Arnold Statham Arthur Horace Todd, and William Toyner, of the Inner Temple; Charles Halman Beard, Richard Robert Cherry, John Lambert C. Gooden, John Carey Hall, William Bold Hurry, Robert Donald Douglas McLenn, Edward George Macleod, Joseph Sidney Merton, William Thomas Raymond, Thomas Crossley Rayner, Ernest Sutton Saurin, John Howard Thomas, and John Wertheimer, of the Middle Temple; Edward William Bather, Charles Fortescue Brickdale, James William Greig, Howard Hodgkin, Kai Ho, George Peterson Francis Keogh, Robert Stewart Menzies, Walter John Napier, Charles Parsons, and Gordon Smith, of Lincoln's-inn; and Henry Loader Beddy, and John Lenton Pulling, of Gray's-inn, Esq.

By order of the council,
(Signed) JAS. ANDERSON, Chairman, *pro tem.*
Council Chamber, Lincoln's-inn, May 24.

In answer to Mr. Norwood, on the 24th inst., the Attorney-General said that the Government were and are most anxious to facilitate measures to improve the law of bankruptcy; but that they had not had sufficient time to bring in a Bill for that purpose to the satisfaction of the House. But he understood that his hon. friend the member for Kendal intended to introduce a Bill, and if a committee should be appointed on that Bill the Government would be anxious to facilitate the labours of that committee; but what the result of those labours would be must depend on the time available for its sittings.

Obituary.

MR. WILLIAM SPOONER.

Mr. William Spooner, judge of county courts, died at his residence, Walton Lodge, Staffordshire, on the 19th inst. Mr. Spooner was the eldest son of the Rev. William Spooner, archdeacon of Coventry, and was born in 1811. He was educated at Oriel College, Oxford, where he graduated second class in classics in 1832. He was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Michaelmas Term, 1837, and formerly practised on the Oxford Circuit, and at the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Sessions. He had a fair share of business at the assizes and sessions, and was for some time a revising barrister. In 1863, he was appointed by Lord Westbury to be judge of county courts for Circuit No. 26, comprising Stafford, Lichfield, and most of the towns in the Potteries district. Mr. Spooner was a magistrate for Staffordshire. He was married to the youngest daughter of Mr. John Wilson, of Seacroft Hall, Yorkshire, and leaves two sons and three daughters. One of his sisters was the late Mrs. Tait, wife of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Appointments, &c.

Mr. HORATIO ALFRED ADAMSON, solicitor, of North Shields, has been appointed Registrar of the North Shields County Court (Circuit No. 1), in the place of Mr. James Henry Ingledew. Mr. Adamson was admitted a solicitor in 1863, and has been for several years town clerk of Tynemouth and clerk to the Urban Sanitary Authority.

Mr. RICHARD BROUGHTON, solicitor (of the firm of Haworth & Broughton), of Acerington, has been appointed Clerk to the Magistrates for that borough. Mr. Broughton was admitted a solicitor in 1878.

Mr. THOMAS CUTHBERT BURN, solicitor, of Cockermouth, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. HARRY FINDEN DAVIES, solicitor, of Weston-super-Mare, has been appointed Registrar of the Weston-super-Mare County Court (Circuit No. 54), in succession to Mr. William Henry Davies, deceased. Mr. H. F. Davies was admitted a solicitor in 1870.

Mr. ALGERNON FLETCHER, solicitor, of Northwich, has been elected Clerk to the Northwich Board of Guardians, Assessment Committee, and Rural Sanitary Authority, and Superintendent Registrar for the district, in succession to Mr. Christopher Cheshire, deceased. Mr. Fletcher was admitted a solicitor in 1867.

Mr. WILLIAM MACKINTOSH, advocate, has been appointed Procurator to the Church of Scotland. Mr. Mackintosh was admitted a member of the Faculty of Advocates in Scotland in 1865.

Sir FRANCIS SMITH, knight, has been appointed to administer the Government of Tasmania during the absence of the Governor, Mr. Weld. Sir F. Smith is the eldest son of Mr. Francis Smith, of Lindfield, Sussex, and was born in 1819. He was educated at University College, London, and graduated B.A. of the University of London in 1840. He was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Easter Term, 1842, and was appointed Solicitor-General of Tasmania in 1849, and Attorney-General in 1854. He was appointed a puisne judge of the Supreme Court of the Colony in 1860, and received the honour of knighthood in 1867. Sir F. Smith became Chief Justice of Tasmania in 1870.

DISSOLUTION OF PARTNERSHIP.

JOHN CHRISTOPHER PAWLE, CHARLES TATHAM FEARON, and GEORGE JOHN COLDHAM, solicitors, No. 11, New-inn, Strand (Pawle, Fearon, & Coldham). May 8, 1880.

(Gazette, May 25, 1880.)

The Hereford election petition is to be heard on the 14th of June before Mr. Baron Pollock and Mr. Justice Hawkins.

Companies.

WINDING-UP NOTICES.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

CHRISTIAN SIGNAL PUBLISHING COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented May 11, directed to be heard before the M.R. on May 29. Hewitt & Alexander, Ely pl, solicitors for the petitioners.

ESTON ODD FELLOWS' BUILDING COMPANY, LIMITED.—The M.R. has fixed Monday, May 31, at 11, at his chambers, for the appointment of an official liquidator.

JOHN MARLAND DAVIES & COMPANY, LIMITED.—The M.R. has fixed Monday, May 31, at 11, at his chambers, for the appointment of an official liquidator.

LONDON COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented May 18, directed to be heard before the M.R. on May 29. Linklater & Co, Walbrook, solicitors for the petitioner.

TUNISIAN RAILWAYS COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented May 18, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins on May 29. Heritage & Co, Clement's lane, solicitors for the petitioner. [Gazette, May 21.]

INTERNATIONAL TRADING COMPANY, LIMITED.—By an order made by V.C. Bacon, dated Apr 24, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Blunt and Co, Gresham st, solicitors for the petitioners.

NEW ZEALAND MANGANESE MINES, LIMITED.—By an order made by V.C. Malins, dated May 14, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the above company be continued. Mercer and Mercer, Mark lane, solicitors for the petitioner.

PATENT LIQUID METALLIC CAPSULING, PATENT, GILDING, AND SILVERING COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up presented, May 21, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins on June 4. Beall, Queen Victoria st, solicitor for the petitioner.

TRAMWAY FERRY COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented May 24, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall, on June 4. Robinson and Cameron, Gracechurch st, agents for Gill and Archer, Liverpool, solicitors for the petitioner. [Gazette, May 25.]

Creditors' Claims.

CREDITORS UNDER ESTATES IN CHANCERY. LAST DAY OF PROOF.

HODGSON, JAMES, Rotherham, York, Corn Miller. June 12. Hodgson v Hodgson. V.C. Hall. Potter and Brown, Rotherham.

LONG, GEORGE THOMAS, Regency st, Westminster. June 1. Long v Long. V.C. Bacon. Draper, Vincent sq.

MAKEPEACE, JOHN, Bracknell, Berks, Esq. June 15. Makepeace v Marsh, M.R. Sargeant, Bracknell.

MOORE, JOHN IRESON, Gledhow terrace, Kensington, Bootmaker. June 15. Moore v Moore, V.C. Bacon. Lickorish, Walbrook.

MORLEY, CHARLOTTE, Brighton. June 20. Morley v Morley, M.R. Dunster, Henrietta st, Cavendish sq.

ROBERTSON, JAMES, Bankend, Southwark, Iron Merchant. June 15. Macgillivray v Whyte, V.C. Malins. Harris, Moorgate st.

TAYLEUR, WILLIAM HOUTBROOKE, Torquay, Esq. June 15. Tayleur v Tayleur, M.R. Richardson, Liverpool. [Gazette, May 18.]

HALL, WILLIAM, Queen's rd, Peckham, Commercial Traveller. May 25. Matkress v Hall, V.C. Malins. Rutter, King's Bench walk, Temple.

RICHARDSON, JOHN MONTE, Putney. June 15. Pyke v Coulson, V.C. Hall. Brown, Carlisle.

THOMAS, WILLIAM, Gloucester. June 26. Thomas v Thomas, District Registrar, Gloucester. Haines, Gloucester.

WRIGHT, JOHN, Mincing lane, Tea Dealer. June 21. Newton v Newton V.C. Hall. Watkins and Co, Sackville st, Piccadilly. [Gazette, May 11.]

CREDITORS UNDER 22 & 23 VICT. CAP. 25. LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

ALLEN, CHRISTOPHER, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Butcher. Aug 2. Keenlyside and Co, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

ANDERSON, JANE, Prestbury, Gloucester. Aug 12. Bubb and Co, Cheltenham.

BAKER, WILLIAM, Shalfleet, Isle of Wight, Yeoman. Aug 10. Beckingsale, Newport.

BODEN, GEORGE, Inner Temple, Q.C. July 1. Graus and Sen, Bedford-row.

BOWMET, JOHN, Kennington rd, Lambeth, Chief Engineer, R.N. June 12. Hallett and Co, St Martin's-pl.

BOOTH, ALBERT, Pressal-cum-Hackensall, Lancaster, Gent. June 16. Grundy and Co, Bury.

BOWLER, JONIAH, Edgeley, nr Stockport, Gent. June 30. Doyle, Manchester.

CHIDLEY, JOHN, Devonshire st, Portland pl, Licensed Victualler. June 13. Layton and Co, Budge-row.

CLARKE, WILLIAM JAMES, Sawbridgeworth, Hertford, Farmer. July 1. Atkinson, Hertford.

CLAY, JAMES, Waterbeach, Cambridge, Farmer. June 1. Wayman, Cambridge.

COLE, EMILY JANE, Upper Hall st, Peckham. June 14. Pattiver College at, College-hill.

DODDS, SARAH MARY, Brighton. July 15. Pedley and Bartlett, Bush lane.

FISCHER, HENRY, Huddersfield, Merchant. July 17. Sykes and Son, Huddersfield.

GILLOTT, ROBERT, Western rd, Brixton, Gent. June 25. Hoyland, Rotherham.

HERMAN, SOPHIA MARY, Mostyn-terrace, Camberwell New rd. July 1. Mason, Maddox st, Regent st.

HITCHING, HILBERT, Wargrave, Berks. June 8. Phelps and Woodford, Red Lion sq.

KNAPP REV. HENRY, Canon of Lincoln. July 1. Fairfoot and Webb, Clement's-inn.

LUMBERT, ELIZABETH, Burghfield, Berks. June 24. Prior and Co, Little-ann-fields.

NEWMAN, EDWARD, Barnsley, York, Esq. July 1. Newman and Sons, Barnsley.

PIKE, JAMES, Old Charlton, Kent, Hop Merchant. June 30. Hawks and Co, Borough High st.

POLLARD, WILLIAM, Whitkirk, York, Farmer. July 1. Spiro, Leeds.

RIDE, JOSEPH, Knighton, Leicester, Gent. June 24. Owston and Dickinson, Leicester.

RODIN, Rt Hon ROBERT, Fourth Earl of, Hertford st, Mayfair. June 30. Kearsley and Co, Old Jewry.

SPENCER, JOHN ROBERTS, Sharnfield, Fils and Steel Manufacturer. June 22. Burdett and Co, Sheffield.

VOLCKMAN, CHARLES, Stratford, Essex, Gent. July 14. Sweepston, Lime st.

WOODHEAD, GODFREY, Manchester, Grocer. July 12. Diggles and Ogden, Manchester. [Gazette, May 18.]

Legislation of the Week.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

MAY 20.—BILLS READ A FIRST TIME.

Conveyancing and Law of Property (Earl Cairns). Limitation of Actions (Earl Cairns). Solicitors' Remuneration (Earl Cairns). Settled Lands (Earl Cairns).

MAY 24.—BILL READ A SECOND TIME.

Bill relative to the Liability of Employers for Compensation for Injuries to their Servants (Earl De la Warr).

MAY 25.—BILL READ A SECOND TIME.

PRIVATE BILL.—Blenheim Settled Estates.

BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Bristol Port and Channel Dock, Mersey Docks and Harbour Board, Deane Valley Water, Doncaster Corporation Water, Millford Docks, Hendon Local Board, Clacton-on-Sea Special Drainage District, West Wickham and Hayes Railway, Freshwater, Yarmouth, and Newport Railway, Trinity Hospital, Greenwich.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MAY 21.—BILLS READ A FIRST TIME.

Bill to Extend and Regulate the Liability of Employers to make Compensation for Personal Injuries suffered by Persons in their Service (Mr. Doxson).

Bill to Amend the Law Relating to the Payment of Wages and the Rating of Merchant Seamen (Mr. Ashley).

Bill to Amend the Law respecting Employers' Liability for injuries to their Workmen (Mr. Macdonald).

Bill to Prohibit the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday in Wales (Mr. Roberts).

Bill to Amend the Law Relating to the Election of Aldermen in Municipal Boroughs (Mr. James).

Bill to Consolidate and Amend the Salmon and Freshwater Fishery Laws of England and Wales (Sir J. Bailey).

Bill for Amending the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, and Securing Compensation for Tenants' Improvements in all cases (Mr. Chaplin).

Bill to Consolidate and Amend the Married Women's Property Acts, 1870 and 1874 (Mr. Hinde Palmer).

Bill to Alter and Amend the Law with Regard to the Registration of Marriages of Persons not Members of the Established Church (Mr. Blennerhassett).

Bill to Improve the Constitution and Extend the District of the Middlesex Land Registry, and to Amend the Law Relating to the Registration and Transfer of Land in Middlesex and the Metropolis (Mr. Hopwood).

Bill to Provide for the Valuation of Lands and Hereditaments in England (Mr. Ramsay).

Bill to Prohibit the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Mr. Stevenson).

Bill to Amend the Laws relating to Lunatics (Mr. Dillwyn).

Bill to Amend the Law relating to the Conditions of Service of Merchant Seamen, and for other purposes relating thereto (Viscount Sandon).

Bill to Amend the Agricultural Holdings (England) Act, 1875 (Mr. Samuelson).

Bill to Legalize Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister (Sir Thomas Chambers).

Bill to Appoint a Commission for the Alteration of Areas of Local Government in Certain Cases, and for Re-arrangement of the Boundaries thereof (Mr. Pell).

Bill to Abolish the Congé d'Elire, and to make provision for the Appointment of Archbishops and Bishops by her Majesty by Letters Patent under the Great Seal (Mr. Monk).

Bill to Amend the Administration of the Inhabited House Duty and Income-tax (Mr. Hubbard).

Bill to Extend the Hours in which Marriages may Lawfully be Solemnised (Mr. Blennerhassett).

Bill to Alter and Amend the Law with regard to the Marriage of Divorced Persons (Mr. Blennerhassett).

Bill to Amend the Bankruptcy Act, 1869 (Mr. Whitwell).

Bill for Consolidating the Law of Partnership (Mr. Whitwell).

Bill for Amending the Bills of Sale Act (1878) Amendment Act (Mr. Whitwell).

Bill to Regulate the Stowing of Grain Cargoes in Merchant Ships (Mr. Anderson).

MAY 24.—BILLS READ A FIRST TIME.

Bill relating to Postal Money Orders (Mr. Fawcett).

Bill to Amend the Law relating to Leases (Mr. Warton).

Bill to Amend the Law relating to the Expenses of Returning Officers at Parliamentary Elections (Mr. Serjeant Simon).

Bill to Amend the Law relating to Burials in England and Wales (Mr. Grantham).

Bill to Amend the Law relating to Patents for Inventions (Mr. Anderson).

Bill to Repeal the Contagious Diseases Acts. Bill to Amend the Licensing Laws (Sir H. Johnstone).

MAY 25.—BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Bristol Corporation, Burton-upon-Trent Corporation, Chester Gas, Eastbourne Gas, Ely and Bury St. Edmunds (Light) Railway.

BILL READ A SECOND TIME.

Public Works Loans.

Court Papers.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	COURT OF APPEAL.	MASTER OF THE ROLLS.	V.C. MALINS.
Monday, May..	31 Mr. Clowes	Mr. Cobby	Mr. Teesdale
Tuesday, June 1	Koe	Jackson	Farrer
Wednesday....	2 Clowes	Cobby	Teesdale
Thursday....	3 Koe	Jackson	Farrer
Friday.....	4 Clowes	Cobby	Teesdale
Saturday....	5 Koe	Jackson	Farrer
	V. C. BACON.	V. C. HALL.	Mr. Justice FRY.
Monday, May..	31 Mr. Leach	Mr. Ward	Mr. King
Tuesday, June 1	Latham	Pemberton	Merivale
Wednesday....	2 Leach	Ward	King
Thursday....	3 Latham	Pemberton	Merivale
Friday.....	4 Leach	Ward	King
Saturday....	5 Latham	Pemberton	Merivale

COURT OF APPEAL.

LIST OF APPEALS FOR TRINITY SITTINGS, 1880.

APPEALS FROM THE CHANCERY DIVISION.

1879.

For Hearing.

Ashworth v Munn app of Missionary Society & ors V C M—Oct 31 (part heard March 23 by Lords Justices James, Brett, and Cotton)
 Tamplin v James app of debt from L J Baggallay for V C M—May 1 (S O by order)
 In re Alven, decd Burrows v Loveband app of Richards and Wife M R—June 2 (pt hd March 9 by Lords Justices James, Brett, and Cotton to come into paper in its turn, by order)

The Singer Manufacturing Co v Loog app of debt V C B—July 26 (Order to be produced)

Jewitt v McHenry app of debt M R—Aug 4 (S O till June 7)

Fellows v Hanbury Hanbury v Fellows app of debt Hanbury V C B—Aug 20 (pt hd May 14 by Lords Justices James, and Bramwell) (S O generally, by order)

In re Wm Fletcher, decd, Simpson v Fletcher app of debts from V C of County Palatine of Lancaster Oct 16

Pugh v Golden Valley Ry Co app of debts Fry, J—Nov 1

In re Young, decd, Young v Dollman app of debt A W Dollman V C H—Nov 8

Tolson v The No 4 Railway Hotel Benefit Building Society app of plt V C B—Nov 29 abated

Swansea Improvements and Tramway Co v The County Roads Board for Glamorganshire app of plt Fry, J—Dec 13

Atlantic Mutual Insurance Company v Huth app of debts (Except Ivaneich and anr) M R—Dec 16

Attorney-Gen v Tomline app of debt Fry, J—Dec 23

In re The Wiggin Rolling Mills Co, limd, and Co's Accts app of Smethurst's executors from V C of County Palatine of Lancaster—Dec 29

Nicholson v Vestry of Mile End Old Town app of debts V C M—Dec 31

1880.

Harris v Morris app of plt from V C of County Palatine of Lancaster—Jan 2

Knight v Pursell app of plt Fry, J—Jan 12

Smith v Anderson app of debt M R—Jan 14

In re Clark, decd Maddick v Marks app of debt V C B—Jan 16

Matthews v Antrobus app of plt V C H—Jan 19

Cummins v Fletcher app of National Provincial Bank V C H—Jan 25

In re Hartry, decd Hudson v Hartry app of debts V C B—Jan 28

Williams v Meakin app of plt V C M—Feb 2

Rolls v Vestry of St. George the Martyr, Southwark app of plt M R—Feb 6

Webster v British Empire Mutual Life Assurance Co app of debts M R—Feb 19

Tottenham Local Board of Health v Rowell app of plt V C M—Feb 19

Taylor v Grange app of plt Fry, J—Feb 21

Ponsonby v Longbourne app of debts Longbourne & anr V C B—Feb 23

In re Hindle, decd Megson v Hindle app of plt M R—Feb 26

Markwith v Hardingham app of debts V C H—Feb 28

In re Wildbore, Expte Met Bd of Works app of Bruce & Clark V C H—Mar 5

Union of French Wine Growers, limd v Brown app of debt Fry J—Mar 6

Laughton v Rylands app of debts V C B—Mar 10

In re Bullivant, decd, Woolrych v Williams app of debt V C H—Mar 10

Woodgate v Watson app of debt Fry, J—Mar 16

Elliott v Dearsley app of debt C F Webb, from part of order on f c Fry, J—Mar 16

Vernon v Vestry of St. James, Westminster app of debt V C M—Mar 19

Lloyds v Harper app of debts Fry, J—Mar 24

Wynne v Bulmer app of plt Fry, J—Mar 25

New Appeals.

Oceanic Steam Navn Co, limd v Sutherland app of plt from V C of County Palatine of Lancaster—Apr 4

Gardner v Archer app of plt from order on fur consen VCM—Apr 6

In re Williams, decd, Williams v Lloyd app of plt in person from order No. 1, dated Mar 17 MR—April 6

In re Williams, decd, Williams v Lloyd app of plt in person from order No 2, dated Mar 17 MR—Apr 6

Goodey v Everett app of plt Fry, J—Apr 8

Hamilton v Snowden app of debts V C M—Apr 14

In re Timbrell, decd, Duignan v Croome app of debt Croome from ord on further consen V C B—Apr 19

In re Leeming, decd Saffroner v Leeming app of Chas. Leeming and anr from V C of County of Palatine of Lancaster—Apr 23

Naylor v Farrer app of debt V C B—Apr 23

Ruston v Tobin app of plt V C M—Apr 27

Robinson v Greaves app of plt M R—May 5

In re Dronfield Silkstone Coal Co, limd app of Frederick Ward M R—May 8

The Chesterfield and Boythorpe Colliery Co v Black app of debts Fry, J—May 11 (S O for security)

Weidig v Isaacs app of debt Fry, J—May 11

Mackie v The Cotton Powder Co The Cotton Powder Co v Mackie app of plt M R—May 12

Jowett v Foster app of plt M R—May 19

Rayner v Preston app of plt M R—May 20

Bishop v Harden app of plts V C B—May 21
 Dawkins v Antrobus app of plts M R—May 21
 From Orders made on Interlocutory Motions in the

Chancery Division.
 1880.

In re Gothenberg Commercial Co, limd app of liquidator V C M—Apr 7 (not before June 9)
 Martin v Tollemache app of defts V C H—Apr 9
 In re Reed, dect Fenwick v Ratcliffe app of John Prosser V C H—Apr 10
 In re Manchester & Milford Ry Co app of L P Pugh V C H Apr 12—(S O by order)
 In re Rutherford, dect Brown v Rutherford app of dect V C H—Apr 13
 Windham v Guibilei app of dect Agnes A Walker from order dated March 23 V C B—Apr 2
 Windham v Guibilei app of dect Agnes A Walker from order dated April 10 V C B—April 14
 Tattersall v Ryder app of defts V C B—Apr 16
 Herring v The Erie Ry Co app of plts M R—Apr 20
 In re The Beverley Iron and Wagon Co app of liquidators V C H—Apr 26
 Jones v Rimmer app of plts from V C of County Palatine of Lancaster Apr 29
 Cotton v Swaine app of dect M R—May 1
 Mitchell v Henry app of plts M R—May 1
 Yeatman v Snow app of plts V C M—May 1 (S O for security)
 Molloy v Kilby app of defts E Izard and wife V C H—May 5
 In re The Anglo-American Leather Cloth Co, limd app of official liquidator V C H—May 10
 In re Southgate, dect Birdsey v Fells app of dect Andrews V C M—May 12
 Kempe v The Anglesea (Pinmore) Marble Quarries Co, limd app of defts R H Jones and another V C H—May 13
 Day v Good app of defts V C M—May 13 (to be in paper on May 25 by order)
 Yeatman v Snow app of plts from order (No. 1) dated April 10 V C M—May 18
 Yeatman v Snow app of plts from order (No. 2) dated April 10 V C M—May 18

FROM THE QUEEN'S BENCH, COMMON PLEAS, AND
 EXCHEQUER DIVISIONS.

For Judgment.

(Heard in Hilary Sittings, 1880.)

Sullivan v Mitcalfe (C P) app of dect Peels & Brown from Mr Justice Grove heard Feb 19 by Lords Justices Bramwell, Baggallay and Thesiger stood over to amend costs of amendt to be disposed of by Court of Appeal
 (Heard in Easter Sittings.)
 Mayor, &c of Carlisle v London & North-Western Ry Co (Exch) app of plts from judgment of Baron Pollock trial (ca v April 24) present Lords Justices Brett, Cotton, and Thesiger

For Hearing.
 1879.

Moscrop v Newbold & ors (Exch) app of defts Grime & anr from judgment of L J Thesiger at trial—Feb 25 Moscrop v Newbold & ors (Exch) app of dect Newbold from judgment of L J Thesiger at trial—Feb 25 (S O till after decision in Exch)
 Rushton v Smith Rushton v Smith (consolidated) (Q B) app of dect from judgment of L J Thesiger after jury trial—April 21 (S O till after decision in Q B Division upon rule for new trial)
 Smith v White (C P) app of plts from judgment of Mr. Justice Lopes after trial without a jury—July 11 (S O for security)
 Thomas & anr v Proprietors of the Birmingham Canal Navigation (Q B) app of plts from L C J of England and Justices Lush and Manisty—July 12 (part heard March 16, referred back to official referee)
 Rowlands v Jones (Exch) app of plts from judgment of Baron Pollock at trial—July 15 (part heard April 24—present Lords Justices Brett, Cotton, and Thesiger)
 The Queen v John Mews and Josiah Oastler, Esqrs, Justices for County of Surrey (Q B Crown Side) app of defts from Mr Justice Denman and Baron Pollock—Aug 12 (part heard April 24—present Lords Justices Brett, Cotton, and Thesiger—on application of counsel stood over by order)
 Cheshire Lines Committee v Lewis and Co (Q B) app of defts from judgment of Mr Justice Lush at trial—Aug 22
 Duke of Norfolk v Arbutnot (C P) app of dect from judgment of Lord Coleridge after trial—Aug 28 (fixed for May 27, by order)
 Brain & anr v Thomas & anr (Exch) app of defts Thomas and Lysaght from judgment of L C Baron and Baron Pollock on special case—Dec 3 (not before June 30, by order)
 Bailey & anr v Ford & ors, trading, &c (C P) app of Midland Ry Co from judgment of L J Thesiger after trial—Dec 11

Bailey and anr v Ford & ors, trading, &c (C P) app of defts Ford & Co from judgment of L J Thesiger after trial—Dec 11
 Bailev & ors v Midland Ry Co (C P) app of defts from judgment of L J Thesiger after trial—Dec 11
 Mitchell v Homfray (Exch) app of plts from rule nisi discharged by L C Baron and Mr Justice Stephen—Dec 16 (part heard May 11—present Lords Justices Brett, Cotton, and Thesiger—on application of counsel stood over by order)
 The West India and Panama Telegraph Co, limd v The Home and Colonial Marine Insurance Co, limd (C P) app of defts from judgment of L J Baggallay after trial—Dec 29 (part heard May 14—present Lords Justices Brett, Cotton, and Thesiger)
 Young v Smith (Q B) app of plts from judgment of Mr Justice Field at trial—Dec 31
 Parsons v Evans (Exch) app of plts from judgment of Baron Pollock at trial—Dec 31

1880.

Ashdown, Trustee, &c v Ingamells (Exch) app of plts from judgment of Baron Huddleston at trial—Jan 5
 Gooch and Wife v The Lambeth Waterworks Co (The Vestry of St. Mary's, Lambeth, 3rd parties) (Exch) app of plts from judgment of Baron Huddleston at trial—Jan 10 (S O for security)
 Ludford v Johnson (Q B) app of plts from judgment of Mr Justice Manisty at trial—Jan 10
 Forwood v The North Wales Mutual Insurance Co limd (Q B) app of dect from judgment of Mr Justice Lush at trial without a jury—Jan 20
 Forwood v The Provincial A 1 Mutual Marine Insurance Co limd (C P) app of defts from judgment of Lord Coleridge after trial—Jan 20
 Budd & anr v Marshall (C P) app of dect from judgment of Mr Justice Grove after trial—Jan 20
 Leader v Knight (C P) app of defts from judgment of Mr Justice Denman after trial—Jan 22
 Rainbow & Wife v Juggins (Q B) app of dect from judgment of Mr Justice Manisty at trial without a jury—Jan 30
 Markwick v Wickham (Q B) app of plts from judgment of L C J of England and Mr Justice Manisty on special case—Jan 31
 Irvine & Co v Watson & Sons (Q B) app of defts from judgment of Mr Justice Bowen, after trial—Feb 2
 Barnes v Leach, since dect (Q B) app of dect from judgment of L C J of England and Mr Justice Lopes on special case—Feb 2
 Glyn, Mills, & Co v The East & West India Dock Co (Q B) app of defts from judgment of Mr Justice Field after trial without a jury—Feb 3
 Prior, Hickman & Co v Hartman (C P) app of dect from judgment of Mr Justice Lindley after trial—Feb 9
 Thornton, trustee, &c v Hyman & anr, trading, &c (Q B) app from judgment of Mr Justice Bowen at trial—Feb 9
 South-Eastern Ry Co v Railway Commrs & the Mayor of Hastings (Q B) app of Ry Commrs from judgment of L C J of England and Justices Lush & Manisty on demr—Feb 11
 Nicholson & anr trading, &c v Keaw ck, Son, & Co (C P) app of defts from judgment of Mr Justice Lindley at trial without a jury—Feb 20
 Rivaz, on behalf, &c v Geruzzi, Bros & Co & anr, trading, &c (Q B) app of defts from judgment of Mr Justice Field after trial—Feb 21
 The Protector Endowment Loan & Annuity Co v Gries (Q B) app of plts from judgment of Mr Justice Bowen at trial—Feb 23
 Mersey Docks & Harbour Board v Martin & Co (Q B) app of defts from judgment of L J Brett at trial—Mar 1
 Wright v Marwood (Q B) argument of rule nisi for new trial granted by Lord Coleridge and Lords Justices Bramwell & Baggallay—Mar 3
 Drury, Trustee, &c v The Staffordshire Fire Insurance Co (Exch) app of plts from judgment of Mr Justice Stephen at trial—Mar 6 (S O for security)
 Thomas Castro, otherwise Arthur Orton, otherwise Sir Charles Doughty Tichborne, Bart v The Queen (Q B Crown side) writ of error upon an indictment for misdemeanour—app of plts in error from sentence dated Feb 28, 1874, by L C J of England and Justices Mellor & Lush—Mar 9
 Henty & ors v Westwood (Q B) app of dect from judgment of Mr Justice Field at trial—Mar 17
 The Queen v S B Sheward (Q B Crown side) app of prosecutors Metropolitan and St John's Wood Ry Co from rule nisi for certiorari discharged by Justices Lush, Manisty, & Bowen—Mar 20
 McDonald v Chesney (C P) app of plts from judgment of Justices Grove & Lindley on official referee's report—Mar 20
 Dixon v The Northfleet Chalk Quarries Co, limd (Exch.) app of plts from judgment of Baron Pollock at trial—Mar 20 (S O for security)
 Holland (by next friend) v Mead & anr (Q B) app of plts from judgment of Mr Justice Bowen at trial—Mar 24
 Grainger v The Mayor, &c, of Dudley (Q B) app of plts from judgment of Mr Justice Manisty after trial—Mar 22

Cawcutt v The Great Eastern Ry Co (C P) app of defts from new trial rule discharged by Justices Grove & Denman—Mar 22
 Mason, executrix v Nicholson, Bart (Exch) app of plt from new trial rule discharged by L C Baron & Sir Henry Hawkins—Mar 24
 Alice A. Warburton, applt v Eli Heyworth, respt (Q B Crown side) app of Alice A. Warburton from judgt of L C J of England and Justices Lush and Manisty on app from magistrate—Mar 25
 Sadler v Kimpton (C P) app of plt from judgt of Justices Grove and Denman on special case—Mar 25
 Lucas, Trustee, &c v Dicker (C P) app of deft from judgt of Justices Lindley & Lopes on special case—Mar 25
 Banner v Culeshaw & anr (Exch) app of deft Morrison from judgment of Lord Justice Brett at trial—Mar 31
 Dominy v Alton (Exch) app of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Stephen at trial—Mar 31
 Goddard v Robson (Exch) app of plt from new trial rule discharged by L C Baron & Mr Justice Stephen—Apr 1

New Appeals.

The Mayor, &c, of Saltash v Goodman & anr (C P) app of deft from judgt of Justices Grove and Denman on special case—Apr 6
 Ellwood v Liverpool Victoria Legal Friendly Society (Exch) app of plt from judgt of L C Baron and Mr Justice Stephen—Apr 6
 Akerblom v Price (Exch) apt of plt from judgt of L C Baron and Mr Justice Stephen—Apr 6 (S O until rule argued in Divisional Court)
 The Noreness Block Ice Shipping v The Royal Mail Steam Packet Co (C P) app of plt from new trial rule discharged by Justices Grove and Lindley—Apr 9
 Herbert & Co v Jennings (Exch) app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Stephen at trial—Apr 9
 Ludgate v Love (C P) app of defts from rule nisi discharged by Justices Grove and Lindley—Apr 12
 By Information and Answer pursuant to Crown Suits Act, 1865 Attorney-General v London & N W Ry Co (Exch revenue side) app of defts from decree of L C Baron and Sir H Hawkins—Apr 14
 Gathercole v Smith app of plt from judgt of Lord Coleridge at trial—Apr 23
 Whaley Bridge Printing Co v Green and anr Green and anr v Whaley B Printing Co (Q B) by original and counter-claim app of deft Green from judgt of Mr Justice Bowen at trial—Apr 24
 Potter & ors, trading, &c v Leonard & anr (Exch) app of plts from L C Baron and Mr Justice Stephen setting aside judgt of county court judge at Sheffield—Apr 24
 Jones v The Colonial Assurance Corporation, lmd (Exch) app of deft from rule nisi discharged by L C Baron and Baron Huddleston—Apr 24
 In re Charles M Roche, gentl. one &c (C P) app of Mr Roche from Lord Coleridge and Mr Justice Grove—Apr 27
 Wake and anr v Hall and ors (C P) app of plts from judgt of Lord Coleridge at trial—Apr 28
 Wilson v Lord Bury and ors verdict, for defts at trial before the Lord Chief Justice rule nisi for new trial granted by Court of Appeal—Apr 28
 Winspear v The Accident Insurance Co, lmd (Exch) app of defts from judgt of L C Baron and Baron Huddleston on special case—Apr 29
 Jardine v Scarf (C P) app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Denman at trial—May 1
 Heath and anr v Pugh and anr (C P) app of plts from Lord Coleridge and Mr Justice Lindley, setting aside verdict—May 1
 In re Walter William Brown, Gent, one, &c Hall v Painter (Exch) app of plt from order of L C Baron directing payment of taxed costs to defts solicitor—May 5
 Bambridge v The Great Eastern Ry Co (Exch) app of deft Co from judgt of Lord Justice Bramwell at trial—May 8
 Lewis v Rees (Exch) app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Lindley at trial—May 8
 The Met Ry Co v Schleman (Q B) app of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Manisty at trial of counter-claim, without a jury—May 12
 Roberts, tég, &c v Edgar, Briffett & Co (Q B) app of defts from rule nisi, discharged by Justices Lush & Field—May 14
 Maude v Goodspeed (C P) app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Lopes at trial—May 14
 Kingeman v Kingeman (C P) app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Lopes at trial—May 14
 Richards v Baker (Q B) app of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Manisty at trial—May 19
 Mullins v The Treasurer of the County of Surrey (Q B) app of deft from judgt of Justices Lush and Manisty on special case—May 19
 The Queen v P H Hutchins (Q B Crown aide) app of prosecu-

tor from Justices Lush and Field quashing order of Sessions—May 20

Mayor, &c, of Wisbech v Commr of Sewers, of Wisbech (Q B) app of defts from judgt of Justices Lush and Field on special case—May 20

From Orders made on Interlocutory Motions in the Common Law Divisions.

1879.

De Oleaga & Co v West Cumberland Iron & Steel Co, lmd (Q B) app of plts from L C J of England and Justices Lush and Manisty—July 12 (S O for security)

1880.

Tattersfield v Finlay (Exch) app of plt from L C Baron and Baron Huddleston rescinding order of district registrar for oral examination and discovery—May 1 (S O till June 2)

Caslon & Co v Gray & Co (Prosecr Clr—Exch) app of plt from L C Baron and Baron Huddleston, dismissing app from order of Mr Justice Field—May 8

Barton v Timmarsh (Exch) app of Edmond Beales, Esq, from L C Baron and Baron Huddleston making rule absolute for prohibition—May 18

Wilks, Trustee, &c v Judge (Exch) app of plt from new trial rule discharged by L C Baron and Mr Justice Stephen—May 18

The Patent Safety Gun Cotton Co, lmd v Wilson (C P) app of plts from order of Mr Justice Grove overruling demurrer to defence—May 19

Barton v Timmarsh (Exch) app of plt from L C Baron and Baron Huddleston, making rule absolute for prohibition—May 20

Shipp v Grey (C P) app of deft from order of Justices Grove and Lopes on special case—May 21

FROM THE PROBATE, DIVORCE, AND ADMIRALTY DIVISION.

For Hearing.

Admiralty.

1879.

Ship City of Mecca—Cotesworth & ors v The Owners of the City of Mecca and Freight app of defts from judgt of Sir R J Phillimore—Dec 10 (S O by order with liberty to restore by consent of both parties)

1880.

Ship Milanese—Owners of the Bokkara and ors v Owners of the Milanese and freight app of defts from judgt of Sir R J Phillimore (with nautical assessors)—Jan 26

Probate.

In re Jane Stratford Boyse, decd Crofton v Gautier (J S Kirwan intervening) app of defts Gautier from judgt of Sir James Hannen (S O for security)—Feb 6

Admiralty.

Ship Sir Robert Peel—National Steam Ship Co v Owners of the Sir Robert Peel app of defts from judgt of Sir R J Phillimore (with nautical assessors)—March 23

New Appeals.

Admiralty.

Ship Vortigern Selby and ors v Dixon and ors app from judgt of Sir J Phillimore (with nautical assessors)—Apr 17

Ship Maude Paterson v Owners of Ship Maude app from interlocutory order of Sir R J Phillimore—May 6

Ship Norseman Owners of ship Quintero and ors v Owners of Ship Norseman app from judgt of Sir R J Phillimore (with nautical assessors)—May 7

Divorce.

Harvey (otherwise Farnie) v Farnie app of plt from dismissal of petition by Sir James Hannen—May 13

FROM THE LONDON BANKRUPTCY COURT.

In re Henley	Ex parte Henley
In re Henley	Ex parte Henley
In re Mason	Ex parte Eschritt
In re Mason	Ex parte Isaacs
In re Phillipin & Co	Ex parte De Chatonville and ors
In re Bunyard	Ex parte Newton
In re Bunyard	Ex parte Griffin
In re Fox & Co	Ex parte Bishop
In re Ranby	Ex parte Ranby
In re Jordan	Ex parte Symmons and anr
In re Watray	Ex parte Thompson
In re Bowes	Ex parte Jackson and ors
In re Dickinson	Ex parte Corker
In re Thomson	Ex parte McGeorge
In re T-bbutt	Ex parte Bunstead
In re Clarke	Ex parte Izard and anr
In re Taylor	Ex parte Brooks
In re Crick	Ex parte Rawlings
In re Gourlay	Ex parte Abbott

Sessions

(Q B)

special

Common

Co, limd

es Lush

ron and

tr for

2)

olt from

m order

ing, from

lute for

ew trial

phen—

) app

murrer

on and

ition—

s Grove

ALTY

he City

ir R J

store by

rners of

Sir R J

Kirwan

James

s of the

Philli-

n judgt

p from

rners of

s (with

T.

missial

T.

le and

anr

rs

In re Pooley
In re Parker
In re Kitchin
In re Phillips
In re Watson
In re Pooley
In re Swaine, Coates & Co
N.B.—The above list contains Final and Interlocutory Appeals, set down to May 21, inclusive.

Ex parte Sheard
Ex parte Charing Cross Advance and Dep sit Bank
Ex parte Punnett
Ex parte National Mercantile Bank
Ex parte Raphael
Ex parte Sheard
Ex parte Swadale, Banking Co

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.

NEW TRIAL PAPER.

For Judgment.
Rushton v Smith
Holroyd v Greaves & anr
Manchester, Turner v Galloway
Middlesex, Keith v Natal India-Field, J
Newcastle, Richardson v Arn-Field, J
strong, pl hd Lush, J
Motion for Judgment.
Easter Sittings, 1880.
London, The Commissioners for executing the office of Ld High Admiral, &c, v Dunn & ors
Liverpool, Evans & Wife v Liverpool United Tramways & Omnibus Co
Bowen, J
Leeds, The Queen v Platts
Lush, J

SPECIAL PAPER.

For Argument.
Gt Western Ry Co v Sirhowy Ry
Same v Dewhurst
Williams & anr v Cambrian Rys
Co
Heywood Local Bd v Chadwick & ors
Hornby v Cardwell (Hanbury 3rd party)
dem
dem
dem

MOTIONS STANDING FOR CONSIDERATION.

County Court of Brentford.
Morrall v Morrall
Crown Side.
Brill v Hogg & anr
Stook v Taylor

RULES STANDING FOR JUDGMENT.

The Queen v The Recorder of Birmingham
The Queen v E Gibbon, Esq, & anr, Justices of Lancashire

CROWN PAPER.

The Queen v Mayor & Aldermen of Falmouth
The Queen v Savin

APPEALS FROM INFERIOR COURTS.

For Judgment.
Woodhouse v Walker
For Argument.
Saunders v South-Eastern Ry Co
Mogg v Churchwardens, &c, of Chadwick v Proudlow
Northumberland Whinstone Co v Alnwick Highway Board
Torquay Market Co v Small

COMMON PLEAS DIVISION.

REMANET PAPER.

New Trials.
Michaelmas Sittings, 1879.
Middlesex, Nowell v Williams
Hilary Sittings, 1880.
London, Hall v Jupe
Manchester, Stones v Salmon & ors
Liverpool, Robson v Amer
Bristol, Stevens & anr v Lopes, Bart
Liverpool, Russell v McGowan & Co
London, Lewis v Ward & anr

New Trials and Motions for Judgment.

Easter Sittings, 1880.
Middlesex, Webb v Soldi
Middlesex, Thomas v Soldi
Middlesex, Burchell v Hickison
London, Watson v The Great Western Ry Co
French v Freeman motn for judgt on behalf of pltt
Middlesex, Tidy v Lillywhite
French v Freeman motn for judgt on behalf of def

To stand over until appeal disposed of.

CUR. ADV. VULT.

Burgess v Northwick Local Bd
Ditcham v Worrall motn for judgt
The Manchester Bonding Warehouse Co, limd, v Carr

PEREMPTORY PAPER.

In the matter of Charles James Cooke, a solicitor
Enlarged to 25th May.
In the matter of Joel Seymour Kisch, a solicitor
Enlarged to 25th May.
In the matter of William Robert Philp, a solicitor.
Enlarged generally and master to report.

SPECIAL PAPER.

Mulholland v The Peninsular Co, limd special case

APPEALS FROM INFERIOR COURTS.

Westaway v Fladgate & anr
Grainger v Aynsley & Co
Bromley v Tams
Phillips v Hale
Rossoni, approver; Sutcliffe, plaintiff; Peal & Figgis, garnishees; Fairman, defendant
Hooper v London & N W Ry Co
Andrew v Swansea Cambrian Benefit Building Soc
Simpson v Morewood & Co
Blackley &c, Building Soc, limd, v Kirkpatrick
Garrad v Firminger
Bowler v Annoot (Annoot & ors, claimants)

EXCHEQUER DIVISION.

NEW TRIAL PAPER.

Liverpool, Moscrop v Newbold & ors
London, Bouffier v Levy & anr
15th November, 1879, part heard before Baron Pollock and Sir H Hawkins.
London, Gleiper v Great Eastern Ry Co
Middlesex, Green v Stewart & anr
York, McDonough v N Eastern Ry Co
Nottingham, Mason v Payne
Middlesex, Cummings v Gt N Ry Co
Durham, Green v Mayor, &c, of Sunderland
London, Armitstead v Pinkney
London, Akerblom v Price & Co
Middlesex, Jaques v London Tram Co
Middlesex, Jones v Baxter
Sir H Hawkins

DEMURRERS.

Groom & anr v Rathbone demr
Triggs v McNamara demr to defence
National Prov Bank of England v Harie & ors demr to def
Harris' defence

SPECIAL CASES.

Cook & ors v Sheard
Part heard 3rd May, 1880, before Baron Pollock and Justice Stephen.
Secretary of State for War v Horsman

CASES STANDING FOR JUDGMENT.

Noble v Edmonds
Marsden v Lanc & York Ry Co
Summer v Schofield

APPEALS FROM INFERIOR COURTS.

Middlesex, Bow, William John Nicholson, Thomas Needham Sheffield, & Frederick Sheffield v William Nicholson
Metrop Police District, Francis Murray v John Davies
To be heard before three judges.
Monmouthshire, Abergavenny, William Parry v George Jones
Stand over for settlement.
Westmoreland, Appleby, John Buck v Midland Ry Co

MIDDLESEX.—TRINITY SITTING, 1880.

This list contains all actions entered in Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer Divisions, in which notice of trial has been given, and also all actions in the Chancery Division, in which notice has been given of trial before a judge and jury, up to and including 26th May, 1880.

LIST OF ACTIONS FOR TRIAL

Ex 1 Hickey (Belfrage and M) v Montefiore (Lewis and Lewis) com SJ
Q B 2 Creed (A J Murray) v Millett (Roscoe, H and S) com
Q B 3 Brown (Merriman, M and Co) v Elkington and ors (Lumley and L) com
C P 4 Wilbraham (Chapman, T and B) v The Maritime Passengers and Mariners Insurance Co, limd (Harrisons and Sons) stayed
Q B 5 Benjamin (J Frost) v Litten (F A Lewty) com
Q B 6 Benjamin (M Abrahams and R) v Higginbottom (F T Dubois) com SJ
Q B 7 Hallward (C B Hallward) v Blanford and ors (O J Curtis; G H K Fisher) postponed
Q B 8 Joshua (A E Webb) v Green (Hare and F) com
Ex 9 Palmes (Lake, H and Co) v Hope and anr (Shoubridge and M) without jury, postponed
Ex 10 Same (Same) v Beavan (Same) without jury, postponed
Ex 11 Liwydian Iron, &c, Co, (Houghton and B) v Fearn (A S H Jones) com
Q B 12 Mayer (A G Ditton) v Robinson (P W Nazor) com
Ex 13 Spiller (C E Goldring) v Baum (Evans and E) postponed
Q B 14 General Share Trust Co, limd (J S Cojeman) v Baum and anr (Same) stayed
Ex 15 Enthoven (Collette and C) v Jacobson (G M Cooke) postponed
C P 16 Chamberlaine (S G Ashwin) v T W Wallington (Whitaker and W) postponed SJ
C P 17 Same (Same) v J Wallington (Same) postponed SJ
Ex 18 Marshall (G M Cooke) v Lindley and anr (J Davies) postponed SJ
C P 19 Chalmers (J Whitehouse) v Chalmers (Nelson, Son and H) com
Q B 20 Bennett (W E Baxter) v England and ors (In person; W F Stokes) stayed
C P 21 Caudle (F T Newbold) v Austin (Morgan and Gilkes) stayed
Q B 22 Proctor (J Neal) v Dunham (Pitman and L) stayed SJ
C P 23 Fajkmajer (Norton, R N and B) v Fothergill and anr (Hol-lams, Son and C; Field, Roscoe and Co) stayed SJ
Ex 24 Page (Hacon and T) v Kerridge (Bridges, S and Co) stayed
Q B 25 Markwick (G Thompson) v Cortis (A S Edmunds) postponed SJ
Q B 26 Moody and anr (Lewis and Lewis) v Fisher (J Donaghe) stayed

Legal News.

- Ex 27 King and Co (Rollitt and Sons) v Mayor, &c of Leamington (H Tyrrell) stayed
- Ex 28 Champion (Daigman and S) v Walter (Parkis and F) com
- Q B 29 Mc Dougal (Snell and G) v Copestake (Mercer and M) stayed SJ
- C P 30 Treadwin (W R Philp) v Nunn (J D Blake) postponed
- C P 31 Funge and anr (J H Child) v Same (Same) postponed
- C P 32 Cuyas v Sampere (Tilleard, G and H) v MacAndrew and Co (Kearsey, Son and H) com SJ
- Ex 33 Pannell (J Goren) v Nunn (J D Blake) postponed
- C P 34 MacFarland (Ashurst, M, C and Co) v Muter (Keen and R) SJ
- Q B 35 Taylor (Hurfurd and T) v Batten (Waltons, B and W) com SJ
- C P 36 Davies and anr (Nickinson, P and N) v Nunn (Blake and W) postponed
- Ex 37 Mc Gregor (W Eley) v Tinker and anr (Rollitt and Son) stayed
- Ex 38 Taylor and ors (R S Taylor and Sons) v Smith and anr (Brandons) postponed
- Q B 39 The Commissioners of the Admiralty (Hare and F) v Union Steam Ship Co (Hollams, Son and C) SJ
- C P 40 Coleman (Campbell, R and Co) v Guigues (E D Lewis) stayed
- Ex 41 Tattershall (Singleton and T) v Bedford (Bellamy and S)
- C P 42 Fowler and ors (Wilson, B and C) v Alison (Thompson and D) without jury
- Ex 43 Stubbs (Yeo and Warner) v Ashton (Bennett, D and B) stayed SJ
- Ex 44 Pearson (C Mossop) v Gardner (Field, R and Co) stayed
- Ex 45 Russell and anr (Taylor, H and T) v Nunn (Blake and W) postponed
- C P 46 Dorking Grey Stone Co, limd (J Edell) v Hack and ors (Saffery and Co) stayed
- C P 47 Cowley (F Scott) v Booth (Rye and C) stayed, SJ
- Q B 48 Henning and anr (Thompson and D) v Mills (Simpson and C) stayed
- Q B 49 Same (Same) v Smerden (J H Lamb)
- Q B 50 Same (Same) v Dimmock (Same)
- C P 51 Gask (J B May) v Nunn (Blake and W) stayed
- Ex 52 Taylor and ors (Paterson, S and B) v Blowes (Beaumont and B) stayed
- Ex 53 Heap (C Mossop) v Hesketh (Lewis and L) postponed SJ
- Q B 54 Brice (Harrison, B and H) v Hecla Fire Insurance Corporation, Fry Garnishee (Chester and Co)
- C P 55 Jacobs (L Davis) v Charles Reynolds and Co (C Sawbridge) com SJ
- Ex 56 Isaacson (Dod and L) v Currie (Lucas and Son) stayed SJ
- Q B 57 Nowell (A G Ditton) v Stocker and ors (W Justice) part heard SJ
- Q B 58 Same (Same) v Bucknill and anr (Mead and D; J Hill) stayed SJ
- Ex 59 Wallis (In person) v Quick (Austen, De Gex and H)
- C P 60 Sadler and ors (Chappell, Son and G) v Nangle (Vallance and V) stayed
- Q B 61 Voss (J W Few) v Thomas (Hemsley and H) stayed
- C P 62 Hooper and anr (Tilleard, G and H) v Mors Le Blanche and Co and ors (L J B Rawlins) com without jury
- Ex 63 Stace and ors (T White and Sons) v Walking and ors (Sole, T and K)
- C P 64 Tasmanian Main Line Ry Co (Wilson, B and C) v Clark and ors (Blunt, T and Co; Burchell; Hargrove and Co) SJ
- Ex 65 Ibbotson (Bordman) v Buckley and ors (Jukes and Co)
- C P 66 Williams (G E Carpenter) v Nowell (A G Ditton) stayed SJ
- Chy 67 Sovereign Life Assurance Co (Campbell, R and H) v Dent (Crook and S) SJ postponed
- C P 68 Grigg (G L P Eyre and Co) v Pearce (J Godwin)
- Ex 69 Goldring and anr (E Jukes) v Headley and ors (Mercer and M)
- C P 70 Crook (F C James) v Clark and Son (G S Warrington) stayed
- Q B 71 King and Co (Earlley, H and R) v Langton (In person) SJ
- Q B 72 Tipples (G Crafter) v Budden (Stollard and W)
- Ex 73 Parkes (T W Goldring) v London and St Katherine Docks Co (W M Hacon)
- Ex 74 Llewellyn (T White and Sons) v Strangward (Saunders, H and B) SJ
- C P 75 Milner (E S Cavell) v Labouchere (Lewis and Lewis) SJ
- Q B 76 Capital and Counties Bank (Nash and F) v Henty and Sons (Robinson, Preston and S) SJ

(To be continued.)

PROBATE AND DIVORCE DIVISION.

During the Trinity Sittings the causes set down for trial will be taken in the following order:—Common jury causes Wednesday, 26th, and following days—first, probate causes; secondly, matrimonial causes. Special jury causes will be heard on Wednesday, June 2, and following days—first, probate causes; secondly, matrimonial causes. Probate and matrimonial causes before the court itself will be taken after the special jury causes in the following order:—Probate causes, defended matrimonial causes, undefended matrimonial causes. The full court will sit on Tuesday, June 1, after motions. Summonses will be heard in chambers at 10.30, and motions in court at 12, every Tuesday during the sittings. All papers for motions on Tuesdays must be left with the Clerk of the Papers in the Probate Registry at Somerset House, or with the chancery clerk of the Divorce Registry at the same place, before 2 o'clock on the preceding Thursday.

On Tuesday week, says the *City Press*, in a case which came before the judge of the City of London Court, it was stated that the plaintiff had not paid the hearing fees, and the case was adjourned for a short time that he might do so. After a brief absence the suitor returned, and informed his Honour that the clerk told him he was too busy to attend to him for the next hour or so; whereupon the learned Commissioner remarked that frequent complaints were made of the block of business in that court, in consequence of the staff of clerks not being sufficient. He was told that it was a matter of regular occurrence for a suitor to have to wait half an hour, and sometimes even longer, before he could be attended to. Mr. Wetherfield corroborated what was said by his Honour; his own clerks had very often to wait half an hour. This was by no means creditable to the authorities of the City. There was no blame whatever to be attached to the gentlemen connected with the court itself. The learned Registrar (Mr. Speechly), in reply to his Honour, said that a memorial drawing attention to this and other matters had been sent to the corporation, but he had not heard that any action had been taken in the affair. His Honour: Well, I cannot help it. I have drawn attention to the subject in the interests of the public, who alone are the sufferers by such neglect and delay in the expeditious discharge of the business of the court.

"J. F. H." writes to the *Times* to caution the public against the following fraud:—"A house is taken on lease at, say £80 per annum, and immediately occupied. On the strength of a respectable residence the tenants get into debt with tradesmen as far as they will let him (which is, unfortunately, perhaps, not an uncommon thing). But the novelty of the fraud, and the matter to which I would particularly call attention, is the following, which has actually happened in a case just recently with which I have had to do. Advertisements are inserted that the house is to be let on lease at a rent less than half that at which the premises have been taken, in consideration of a premium of (in the case referred to) £200, on which a deposit of the usual amount—£10 per cent.—is required to be paid on a contract being signed. An underlease is then prepared, which the tenant is expected to take without inquiring into the lessor's right to grant it, and the fact of his being in possession of the premises gives some colour to the proceeding. In the case above mentioned, after the contract was signed and a deposit of £20 paid, the proposed lessor pressed for the matter to be completed with great speed, as time was important. Being then instructed as solicitor for the proposed lessee, I requested the intended lessor to produce the lease under which he held the premises, to show his right to grant the lease he was about to do, which, however, he strongly objected to, and a firm of solicitors, whom he at last employed, asserted that they had seen his lease, but did not produce it or disclose the fact that it was held at a rent of more than double that at which it was proposed to let the premises. When the lessor found that he could not get the matter completed without showing his title, he, by his solicitors, gave notice of his intention to cancel the contract, and then disappeared from the premises, leaving my client minus his £20 paid as deposit; and his own solicitors now do not know where he has gone to."

Mr. J. Perry Godfrey, in an interesting pamphlet on "The Bar, Solicitors, and the Public," says that "the present Master of the Rolls, in answer to a letter from myself asking his Lordship's opinion upon the subject, has been good enough to reply that he 'considers some alteration desirable as regards the rules of admitting solicitors to the bar;' and Mr. Godfrey gives the following as a Bill on the subject:—"A Bill to Amend the Law relating to Legal Practitioners.—1. This Act may be cited as the 'Legal Practitioners Act.' 2. Every person who shall have been a certificated solicitor for a period of not less than ten years, but who shall not have been admitted a solicitor under the provisions of section 4 of the Solicitors Act, 1860, or who shall not have been exempted under section 11 of the Solicitors Act, 1877, from passing the preliminary examination; and who shall have procured

himself to be struck off the roll of solicitors of the Supreme Court, and shall obtain a certificate, signed by the president or other the chief officer for the time being of the Incorporated Law Society of the United Kingdom, on behalf of the council of the said society (being the society mentioned in the Solicitors Act, 1877) of his being a fit and proper person to practise as a barrister, shall be entitled to be admitted a member of any of the Inns of Court upon payment of the usual fees (other than deposit or caution money) payable on such admission, and after having been so admitted he shall be entitled to be examined by the Council of Legal Education, or other the duly authorized examining power at the next final or any subsequent final examination of members of the inn to which he has been so admitted, and on passing such examination to receive a certificate that he has so passed, as if he had kept all his terms and had otherwise qualified himself for such examination, and upon obtaining such certificate he shall, as regards his being called to the bar, be in the same position in all respects as if he had been a student of such inn, and had conformed to all the regulations, and complied with all the formalities required by the inn to be observed or complied with respectively as a preliminary to his being called to the bar, and be entitled to be called accordingly. 3. This Act shall not extend to Scotland or Ireland."

SALES OF ENSUING WEEK.

- May 31.—SEDGWICK, SON, & WEALL, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold Properties (see advertisement, May 22, p. 5.)
- June 1.—Messrs. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, FARMER, & BRIDGEWATER, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Advowson (see advertisement, May 1, p. 516).
- June 1.—Mr. WALTER KNIGHT, at Masons' Hall Tavern, Basinghall-street, at 1 p.m., Leasehold Properties (see advertisement, this week, p. 3).
- June 2.—Messrs. FAREBROTHER, ELLIS, CLARK, & Co., at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold and Leasehold Properties (see advertisements, May 8, p. 8, and May 22, p. 6).
- June 2.—Messrs. EDWIN FOX & BOUSFIELD, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold Property (see advertisement, May 8, p. 7, and this week, p. 584).
- June 2.—Messrs. HARVEY & DAVIDS, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold Property (see advertisement, this week, p. 3).
- June 3.—Mr. MILLAR, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold Property (see advertisement, this week, p. 3).
- June 3.—Messrs. NORTON, TRIST, WATNEY, & Co., at Southend, Leasehold Properties (see advertisement, May 15, p. 8, and May 22, p. 5).
- June 4.—Messrs. NORTON, TRIST, WATNEY, & Co., at the Mart, Freehold and Leasehold Properties (see advertisement, May 15, p. 8).

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTH.

OWLES.—May 24, at Sunnyside, Beckenham, the wife of Eustace William Owles, solicitor, of a daughter.

DEATH.

FIELD.—May 24, at Southsea, Louisa, wife of the Hon. Mr. Justice Field.

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

May 27, 1880.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

3 per Cent. Consols, 99½	Annuities, April, '80, 9½
Ditto for Account, 99½	Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1898
Do. 3 per Cent. Reduced, 97½	Ex Bills, £1000, 2½ per Ct. 2 pm
New 3 per Cent., 97½	Ditto, £500, Do. 2 pm
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Ditto, £100 & £500, 2 pm
Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Bank of England Stock, 272½
Annuities Jan. '80	Ditto for Account.

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

Ind. Stk., 5 per C., July, '80, 104	Inf. Pr. 5½ per Cent., May, 81
Ditto for Account —	Ditto Debentures, 4 per Cent
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '88, 103½	April, '84
Ditto, ditto, Certificates —	Do. Do. 5 per Cent., Aug. '73
Ditto Encased Pr., 4 per Cent.	Do. Bonds, 4 per Cent. £1000
2nd Inf. Pr., 5 per C., Jan. '73	Ditto, ditto, under £1000

LONDON GAZETTES.

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, May 21, 1880.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.
To Surrender in London.

- Topham, James, Leytonstone, Essex. Pet May 19. Peyps. June 2 at 1
- Turner, Philip, Old Kent rd, Butcher. Pet May 20. Peyps. June 9 at 11
- Williamson, John Austin, High st, Borough, Corn Merchant. Pet May 15. Peyps. June 2 at 1
- To Surrender in the Country.
- Coupees, Margaret, Altrincham, Chester, of no occupation. Pet May 13. Lister. Manchester, June 4 at 12
- Crumstone, William, Worthen, Salop, Farmer. Pet May 19. Talbot. Newtown, June 2 at 12.30
- England, Alfred Ives, Salisbury, Wilts, Draper. Pet May 18. Wilson. Salisbury, June 3 at 12
- Manners, Alfred, Shaftesbury, Dorset, Grocer's Salesman. Pet May 18. Wilson. Salisbury, June 3 at 11

TUESDAY, May 25, 1880.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in the Country.

- Clark, Thomas Powell, Erith, Kent, Builder. Pet May 18. Hayward. Rochester, June 3 at 2
- Curwen, Alfred Francis, Harrington, Cumberland, Clerk in Holy Orders. Pet May 27. Were. Whitehaven, June 11 at 11

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, May 21, 1880.

Hardy, Jeffery, Plymouth, Wine Merchant. May 12

TUESDAY, May 25, 1880.

Green, Daniel, Gillingham, Kent, Brick Agent. May 10

Skipper, Frederick, Duke st, St James'. May 21

Liquidations by Arrangement. FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, May 21, 1880.

- Aimes, John Tooth, jun, Loose, Kent, Cattle Salesman. June 3 at 12 at offices of Goodwin, Mill st, Maidstone
- Andrew, Edward Lawrence, Peckham Park rd, Provision Dealer. June 2 at 2 at the Creditor's Association, Arthur st. Carter and Bell, Eastcheap
- Austin, Benjamin George, Wool Exchange, Accountant. May 31 at 11 at offices of Philpott, Guildhall chambers, Basinghall st
- Barlow, Peter William, Broadstairs, Kent, Gentleman. June 5 at 2 at the Guildhall Coffee house, Guildhall
- Barnshaw, Thomas, Hebburn New Town, Durham, Grocer. June 8 at 11 at offices of Keenlyside and Co, Grainger st West, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
- Braine, Edwin Joseph, Birmingham, Cork Manufacturer. June 4 at 11 at offices of Powke, Ann st, Birmingham
- Bridge, Edward, Bishopsgate at Within, Grocer. June 10 at 2 at the Creditors' Association, Arthur st East. May and Co, Adelaide pl, London Bridge
- Brooks, Thomas, Whitwick, Leicester, House Furnisher. June 4 at 1 at the Queen's Head Hotel, Market st, Ashby-de-la-Zouch
- Dewes and Musson, Ashby-de-la-Zouch
- Burgess, William, Luton, Bedford, Straw Hat Manufacturer. June 1 at 11 at offices of Ewen and Roberts, Park st West, Luton
- Cashmore, Eli, Oakthorpe, Derby, Grocer. June 8 at 12 at offices of Fisher and Co, Ashby-de-la-Zouch
- Cooper, John, Wednesbury, Stafford, Auctioneer. June 2 at 4 at offices of Brooks, Oriel chambers, Bridge st, Walsall
- Corbett, Joseph, Amble, Northumberland, Grocer. June 4 at 11 at offices of Tate, Michael's lane, Alnwick
- Cox, Cecil, Dorchester, Butcher. June 8 at 2 at the Royal Oak Inn, Dorchester. Weston, Dorchester
- Davies, Thomas, Liverpool, Chemist. June 2 at 3 at offices of Quilliam, Old Post Office place, Liverpool
- Dommett, Richard, Bedminster, Bristol, General Dealer. May 29 at 11 at offices of Andrews, Nicholas st
- Drewett, George, New Maldon, Surrey, Builder. June 3 at 11 at offices of Kempster, Lower Kennington lane, Lambeth
- Evans, Charles, Frome, Somerset, Picture Frame Maker. June 5 at 11 at offices McCarthy, Frome
- Evans, Edward, Newport, Monmouth, Innkeeper. June 2 at 2 at offices of David, Cambrie chambers, Tredegar place, Newport
- Evans, Evan, Clynog, Carnarvon, Licensed Victualler. June 4 at 3 at offices of Jones and Roberts, Church st, Carnarvon
- Figg, James, Aylesbury, Buckingham, Baker. June 1 at 11 at the Prince of Wales Hotel, Aylesbury. Bigden, Finsbury sq
- Fitton, Maria, Heywood, Lancashire, Eating house keeper. June 4 at 10 at offices of Banks, Market place, Heywood
- Fowler, William, Oldham, Lancashire, Butcher. June 8 at 3 at the Dog and Partridge Hotel, Fennel st, Manchester. Clegg, Oldham
- Gameson, Henry, Birmingham, Licensed Victualler. June 4 at 3 at offices of Buller and Bickley, Bennett's hill, Birmingham
- Gaskin, Charles, East Dereham, Nurseryman. June 10 at 11 at offices of Wright and Co, East Dereham
- Gilks, Charles Henry, and Chilton Mewburn, Union row, Little Tower Hill, Gun Makers. June 1 at 3 at offices of Birchall, Mark lane
- Gold, Levy, Middlesex st, Algate, Clothier. May 31 at 3 at offices of Cattlin, Wormwood st, Old Broad st
- Goodchap, William Edward, Handsworth, Stafford, out of business. June 2 at 11.30 at offices of Powell and Browett, Ann st, Birmingham
- Harper, Richard Thompson, Darlaston, Stafford, Butcher. June 3 at 3 at offices of Rhodes, Queen st, Wolverhampton

Hassells, Thomas, Macclesfield, General Draper. June 4 at 11 at offices of Groggatt, Chestergate, Macclesfield
 Hodgson, James, Chippengham, Wilts, Coach Builder. June 2 at 11 at offices of Phillips, Market pl, Chippengham
 Howell, Martha, Victoria ter, Chiswick. June 11 at 2 at offices of West, Queen Victoria st
 Hughes, Evans, Talsarnan, Merioneth, Coal Dealer. June 4 at 1 at offices of Jones and Jones, Brecon pl, Portmadoc
 Hunter, William, Manchester, Commission Agent. June 3 at 3 at offices of Payne and Galloway, Brazennose st, Manchester
 Johnston, John Bryce, Sale, Chester, Nurseryman. June 12 at 3 at the York Hotel, York st, Manchester
 Jones, Abraham, New Swindon, Wilts, Grocer. May 31 at 11 at offices of Boodle, Albion bldgs, New Swindon
 Lansbury, Thomas, King's rd, Chelsea, Draper. May 27 at 3 at offices of Charlton and Co, Queen Victoria st. Heurn, Queen Victoria st
 Leighton, William, Carlisle, Cumberland, Builder. June 11 at 3 at Bush Hotel, Carlisle. Farish, jun, Brampton
 Mace, John, Lupus st, Pimlico, Boot Maker. May 25 at 4 at Mitre Tavern, Mitre ct, Temple. Staniland, North rd, Highgate
 Mason, William, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, Architect. June 4 at 11 at offices of Burton, Dyott terrace, Tunbridge Wells
 Matthews, Colin Paget, St. Leonard's-on-Sea, out of business. June 9 at 2 at offices of Greenfield, Queen Victoria st
 Milward, George, Liowes, Radnor, Farmer. June 8 at 10.15 at Crown Hotel, Hay. Corner, Hereford
 Montgomerie, Robert Hunter, Waltham Cross, Hertford, Draper. June 9 at 3 at 111, Cheapside. Haigh and Agar, Gresham st
 Morris, William, and Thomas Morris, Aston-juxta-Birmingham, Stone Masons. June 3 at 2 at offices of Burton, Union passage, Birmingham
 Parsons, Frederick, Meadow st, Stoke Newington, Cowkeeper. June 4 at 3 at offices of Parkes, Queen Victoria st
 Phillips, John, White Hart st, Kennington park rd, Engineer. May 31 at 2 at Bridge House Hotel, Borough High st. Arnold, Town-hall chambers
 Price, Thomas, Crewe, Chester, Grocer. June 9 at 11 at Bank Room Mechanics' Institution, Crewe. Hill, Crewe
 Roe, Edward, Swansea, Saddler. May 28 at 11 at offices of Thomas, York pl, Swansea
 Salter, John, Chippengham, Wilts, out of business. June 2 at 1 at Temperance Hotel, Chippengham. Smith, Melksham
 Shelley, George, Walsall, Stafford, Boot Dealer. June 3 at 11 at the George Hotel, Walsall. Bill, Walsall
 Sinclair, John, New Cle, Lincoln, Fish Merchant. June 5 at 11 at offices of Stephenson and Mountain, Bethlehem st, Great Grimsby
 Starr, Frederick (not Frank, as erroneously printed in last Gazette), Cornhill, Dressing Case Manufacturer. May 29 at 2 at offices of Gruber, Railway approach, London bridge
 Stephenson, Alfred, Bolton, Lancaster, Tobacconist. June 8 at 2 at the Dog and Partridge Inn, Fennel st, Manchester. Anderton and Donnelly, Bury
 Stones, James William, Manchester, Paper Merchant. June 8 at 3 at offices of Chorlton, Cross st, Manchester
 Sutton, John, Middlesbrough, out of business. June 4 at 11 at offices of Garbutt and Fawcett, Finkle st, Stockton-on-Tees
 Thomas, Edwin John, Lowestoft, Suffolk, Wine Merchant. June 10 at 12 at the Castle and Falcon Hotel, Aldersgate st. Digby and Evans, Maldon
 Thomas, John, Usk, Monmouth, Innkeeper. June 3 at 12 at offices of Gibbs and Llewellyn, Bridge st, Newport
 Thompson, Peter, Lorton, Lancaster, Hay Dealer. June 5 at 11 at offices of Stuart, King st, Wigan
 Topping, Harry, Beacondale rd, Upper Norwood, Traveller. June 7 at 3 at offices of Tarrant and Mackrell, Bond ct, Walbrook
 Vorley, Henry, Sheffield, Oil Merchant. June 3 at 2 at the Cutler's Hall, Church st, Sheffield. Rodgers and Co, Sheffield
 Wallis, Francis Beeby, Kettering, Northampton, Engineer. June 3 at 2 at Royal Hotel, Kettering. Lamb, Kettering
 Welbore, John, Spring Bank, Kingston-upon-Hull. May 31 at 3 at offices of Chambers, Scale lane, Kingston-upon-Hull
 Whittaker, William, Bristol, Mill Stone Manufacturer. May 29 at 11 at offices of Thorne, Guildhall, Broad st
 Williams, John, Chepstow, Monmouth, Licensed Victualler. June 3 at 12 at offices of Parsons, High st, Bristol
 Willsmer, George, Leyton, Essex, Builder. June 4 at 3 at Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st, Vernode, New Broad st
 Wilson, John, Newlyn rd, Tottenham, Builder. June 7 at 3 at Mason's Hall Tavern, Mason's avenue, Basinghall st. Rumney, Walbrook
 Wilson, Thomas, Fredworth, Gloucester, Butcher. May 31 at 11 at offices of Franklin, Berkeley st, Gloucester
 Woodward, William, New Swindon, Wilts, Grocer. May 29 at 2 at offices of Jackson, Albion bldgs, New Swindon
 Wright John, Creden, Stafford, Butcher. June 1 at 10.30 at offices of Cope, Waterloo rd, Burslem

Tuesday, May 25, 1880.

Alsop, George, Northampton, Plumber. June 10 at 2 at offices of George and Rands, Newland, Northampton
 Appleby, Walter, Canrobert st, Bethnal Green, Trimming Manufacturer. June 5 at 1 at offices of Mortimore, Coleman st
 Ashmore, John, Hamstall, Ridware, Stafford, Butcher. June 8 at 2 at the Shrewsbury Arms Hotel, Rugeley. Morgan, Stafford
 Asbury, Henry, Wombridge, Salop, Licensed Victualler. June 7 at 10 at offices of Ashmall, Albion st, Hanley
 Barker, John, Stockton-on-Tees, Innkeeper. June 11 at 3 at offices of Bell and Son, Church st, West Hartlepool
 Bartindale, Charles, Northallerton, York, Saddler. June 4 at 3 at offices of Waisell, Northallerton
 Bennett, Thomas, Battersea Park rd, Lath Render. June 2 at 3 at offices of Gray, Finsbury pl
 Bradbury, John, Ashton, near Birmingham, late Captain in her Majesty's Forces. June 6 at 12 at offices of Joynt, New st, Birmingham
 Bradley, Thomas Baker, Sheffield, Estate Agent. June 10 at 3 at offices of Burdakin and Co, Norfolk st, Sheffield

Bristol, Joseph, Paulton, Warwick, Miller. June 7 at 11 at offices of Wright and Gledhill, North st, Rugby
 Brummitt, Edward, Spalding, Lincoln, Blacksmith. June 17 at 12 at the White Hart Hotel, Spalding. Maples and Son, Spalding
 Butler, Joseph Benjamin, Leeds, Shoe Manufacturer. June 4 at 3 at offices of Simpson and Burrell, Albion st, Leeds
 Calvert, Charles Henry, Southampton, Publisher. June 3 at 3 at Guildhall Coffeehouse, Bell, Southampton
 Castle, Robert, Howden, York, Farmer. Altered from May 24 to June 7 at 3 at offices of Weddall and Parker, Selby
 Chambers, Charles, Grantham, Haberdasher. June 4 at 11 at offices of Press, Friar lane, Nottingham
 Christian, Thomas Murray, and James Henry Christian, Chester, Joiners. June 17 at 2 at offices of Ivey, Church st, Liverpool
 Lupton, Liverpool
 Clifford, Alexander, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Printer. June 10 at 11 at offices of Keenlyside and Co, St John's chambers Grainger st West, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Cochran, Hugh, Barrow-in-Furness, Carpenter. June 8 at 11 at Trevelyan Temperance Hotel, Church st, Barrow-in-Furness
 Sims, Barrow-in-Furness
 Colthup, Alfred, Chantry lane, Canterbury, Builder. June 9 at 11 at offices of Collard, Castle st, Canterbury
 Combe, David, Cheapside, Dentist. June 4 at 3 at offices of Durant, Guildhall chambers, Basinghall st
 Coulson, Squire, Pudsey, nr Leeds, Woollen Cloth Manufacturer. June 3 at 3 at offices of Carr, Albion st, Leeds
 Cox, William, Torquay, Devon, Auctioneer. June 5 at 11 at offices of Campion, Bedford circus, Exeter
 Dungey, Thomas Edwin, Ratray rd, Brixton, Grocer. June 2 at 4 at offices of Hanson, King st, Cheapside. Terry, King st
 Duman, John Sampson, Woodborough, Wilts, Draper. June 5 at 2 at offices of Marshall, Marlborough. Tittle, Bath
 Draper, James, Chorlton-cum-Hardy, near Manchester, Joiner. June 7 at 3 at offices of Ruins, Princess st, Manchester
 Errington, Francis, William Errington, and John Errington, Far-ncliffe, Northumberland. June 10 at 2 at offices of Gibson, the Guildhall, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Fairbairns, Ephraim, Knottingley, York, Builder. June 4 at 11 at Brunswick Hotel, Borough Market pl, Wakefield
 Fennell, George, Edgware rd, Toy and Fancy Goods Dealer. June 7 at 3 at offices of Scott and Barham, King st, Cheapside
 Flockton, Charles Poston, Tottenham st, Tottenham ct rd, Comedian. June 9 at 12 at offices of Moss, Gracechurch st
 Francis, Eli, Westbury, Wilts, Market Gardener. June 2 at 4 at offices of McCarthy, Frome
 Freeman, John, Birmingham, out of business. June 7 at 11 at offices of Blewett, Waterloo st, Birmingham
 Godbold, Henry James, St. Leonard's-on-Sea, Photographer. June 7 at 2 at offices of Norris and Carless, Gensing Station rd, St. Leonard's-on-Sea
 Goodrich, Joseph Alfred, Leicester, Carpenter. June 7 at 3 at offices of Wright and Hincks, Belvoir st, Leicester
 Green, Thomas, Earley, Berks, Farmer. June 11 at 12 at offices of Field, Forbury, Reading
 Greenland, Henry, Bedminster, Bristol, Tailor. May 26 at 12 at offices of Meeres, Nicholas st, Bristol
 Grundon, William, Horbury, York, Woollen Merchant. June 7 at 3 at offices of Hattrick and Co, Bond st, Dewsbury
 Haberfield, William, Shirenewton, nr Chester, Monmouth, Shop-keeper. June 8 at 3 at offices of Griffiths and Son, Beaufort sq, Chepstow. Tomlinson, Newport
 Hague, Sam, Liverpool, Music Hall Proprietor. June 7 at 3 at offices of Gibson and Co, South John st, Liverpool. Frodsham and Nicholson, Liverpool
 Head, John Edward, St George's, Gloucester, Dairyman. June 2 at 12 at offices of Meeres, Nicholas st, Bristol
 Heah, John William, Gratton, Stafford, Builder. June 3 at 11 at Harcourt Hotel, Kidsgrove. Stevenson, Hanley
 Henderson, James, Houghton-le-Spagne, Durham, Boot Maker. June 9 at 11 at offices of Chambers, Sadler st, Durham
 Herbert, George Oliver Edwin, Oxford, out of business. June 7 at 2 at Unicorn Hotel, Moreton-in-Marsh. Barks, Moreton-in-Marsh
 Holmes, George Joseph, Pakenham st, Gray's inn rd, Clerk in the General Post Office. June 8 at 3 at offices of Peddell, Guildhall chambers, Basinghall st
 Irons, Elijah, Northampton, Boot Manufacturer. June 17 at 3 at offices of Beeke, Derrigate, Northampton
 Jacobs, Alfred, Essex st, Kingsland rd, Ostrich Feather Manufacturer. June 7 at 2 at offices of Collings, Buckingham st, Strand
 James, John Burrough, Ludgate-hill, Public Accountant. June 4 at 3 at offices of Morris, Paternoster row
 James, Amos, Luton, Bedford, Blocker. June 5 at 11 at offices of Even and Roberts, Park st, West Luton
 Joy, Robert, Wharfs, Paddington, Cab Proprietor. June 3 at 3 at offices of Andrews and Mason, Ironmonger lane. Castle, Poultry
 Keeping, James William, Winkton, Hants. June 7 at 12 at the Pembroke Hotel, Bournemouth. Howard, Melcombe Regis
 Kenward, George, Warling, Sussex. Miller. June 8 at 3 at the Star Hotel, Lewes. Simeock, Hailsham
 Knight, George, Flaxley, Westbury-on-Severn, Gloucester, Farmer. June 14 at 12 at offices of Parker, Nowham
 Lamb, George Philip, Clarendon sq, St Pancras, Dealer in Wearing Apparel. June 17 at 3 at offices of Clark, Polygon, Clarendon sq, St Pancras
 Lancey, John, Neath, Glamorgan, Builder. June 7 at 3 at the Castle Hotel, Neath. Donaghy, Swansea
 Lee, Thomas Hutchings, Low Walker, Northumberland, Grocer. June 7 at 2 at offices of Eldon, Royal arcade, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Leighton, George, Lancaster, Tailor. June 8 at 11 at offices of Clark and Co, Sun st, Lancaster
 Lester, Edward, Carmarthen, Jeweller. June 5 at 11 at offices of Morris, Quay st, Carmarthen
 Lloyd, Charles John, Larkhall lane, Clapham, Broker. June 11 at 11 at the Spread Eagle Hotel, Wandsworth. Ody, Camberwell New rd

Mason, Frederick John, Birmingham, Grocer. June 7 at 11 at offices of Rowlands, Corporation chambers, Ann st, Birmingham
 Meinerzhagen, Edward John Henry, and Henry Turner, Mincing lane, Colonial Merchants. June 8 at 2 at Guildhall Tavern, Basinghall st. Mercer, Mark-lane
 Mines, George, Lower Eaton, Bristol, out of business. June 7 at 12 at offices of Beckingham, Albion chambers, Broad st, Bristol
 Morley, William, Seven Sisters rd, Holloway, Oilman. June 10 at 2 at Law Institution, Chancery lane. Thomson and Ward, Bedford row
 Neeld, William, Rugeley, Stafford, Boot and Shoe Maker. June 7 at 2 at offices of Glover, Brook sq, Rugeley
 Oliver, William George, St Denis, Cornwall, Quarryman. June 9 at 1 at King's Arms Inn, St Stephens, Branwell. Coode and Co, St Austell
 Parmiter, Stanislaus George, Wareham, Dorset, Watchmaker. June 9 at 11.30 at Red Lion Hotel, Wareham. Howard, Weymouth
 Partridge, John, Birmingham, Ale and Porter Dealer. June 2 at 11 at offices of Parry, Colmore row, Birmingham
 Pearce, Charles Gilbert Playdell, Oxhill, Warwick, Malster. June 14 at 1 at offices of Hancock and Hiron, Shipston-on-Stour
 Pennington, Walter, Longridge rd, Kensington, Clerk in Holy Orders. June 7 at 2 at offices of Tilley and Soames, Finsbury pavement
 Poole, Henry, Cockshot, Salop, Farrier. June 4 at 11 at offices of Morris and Son, Swan hill, Shrewsbury
 Powell, James, and John Baker, Tranmere, Chester. Hay and Straw Dealer. June 9 at 11 at offices of Francis, Hamilton sq, Birkenhead
 Price, Watkin, and William Lewis, Govilon, Monmouth, Iron Manufacturers. June 7 at 12.30 at offices of Daniel and Jones, Newport. Lewis, Merthyr Tydfil
 Price, William, jun, Stockton-on-Tees, Grocer. June 1 at 2 at Gregory's Corporation Hotel, Church row, Stockton-on-Tees. Teale, Middlesbrough
 Reeve, John, Birmingham, Saude Manufacturer. June 4 at 10.30 at offices of East, Temple st, Birmingham
 Richardson, Joseph, Denmark hill, Camberwell, Bedstead, Manufacturer. June 9 at 3 at the Station Hotel, Camberwell New rd. Ody, Camberwell New rd
 Riches, Frederick Adolphus, Montpellier rd, Peckham, Carman. June 3 at 3 at offices of Chippendale, Trinity st, Southwark
 Rogers, Daniel, Willenhall, Stafford, of no occupation. June 5 at 11 at the Bull's Head Inn, High st, Bilston. Fellows, Bilston
 Rowley, Edgar John, Salisbury, Wilts, Publican. June 3 at 3 at the Bull Hotel, Fishertonst, Salisbury. Hill and Slader, Salisbury
 Senior, Edward Corbett, Tettenhall Wood, near Wolverhampton, Milkman. June 5 at 11 at offices of Rudland, Queen st, Wolverhampton
 Shaker, William, Bunbury, Chester, Machinist. June 4 at 2 at offices of Warburton, Nantwich rd, Crewe
 Smith, Charles Henry, Birmingham, Grocer. June 7 at 10.15 at offices of East, Temple st, Birmingham
 Smith, Josiah, Great Marlow, Bucks, Butcher. June 12 at 11 at offices of Rawson, High st, Great, Marlow
 Smith, William, Keighley, York, Auctioneer. June 9 at 11 at offices of Gamble and Harvey, Gresham buildings, Robinson and Robinson, Keighley
 Stargott, Abraham, Cinderford, Gloucester, Tailor. June 14 at 4 at offices of Parker, Newnam
 Stenning, George, Haslemere, Surrey, Carpenter. June 8 at 2 at offices of Craig, High st, Gulliford

Syder, Frederick, Lower Tooting, Surrey, Butcher. June 4 at 11 at the Mitre Hotel, Lower Tooting- Chappell and Co, Golden sq
 Symes, William Henry, Boston, Lincoln, Brewer. June 4 at 12 at offices of Thomas, Emery lane, Boston
 Taylor, Robert Arthur, Birmingham, Machinist. June 4 at 12 at offices of Hawkes and Weekes, Temple st, Birmingham
 Thorpe, Henry, Keyham, Leicester, Builder. June 7 at 11 at offices of Wright, Gallowtree gate, Leicester
 Underhill, Francis, Birmingham, Fruit Salesman. June 1 at 10.30 at offices of Smith, Temple st, Birmingham
 Villiers, John, Birmingham, Builder. June 2 at 3 at offices of Parry Colmore row, Birmingham
 Wait, Robert, Watford, Northampton, Innkeeper. June 5 at 3 at offices of Roche, St Giles st, Northampton
 Walker, Henry Alfred, Lodging House Keeper, Hastings. June 8 at 1a offices of Chalinder, Trinity st, Hastings
 Wheway, George, Birmingham, Manufacturing Confectioner. June 7 at 12 at offices of Hawkes and Weekes, Temple st, Birmingham
 Williams, Robert, Llandovery, Carmarthen, Surgeon. May 31 at 11 at offices of Howell, Stepney st, Llanely
 Wilson, William, Littletown, York, Plumber. June 5 at 11 at offices of Sykes, Heckmondwike
 Zolki, Abraham, Sheffield, Jeweller. June 2 at 3 at offices of Pier-son, Queen st, Sheffield

SCHWEITZER'S COCOATINA,

Anti-Dyspeptic Cocoa or Chocolate Powder.

Guaranteed Pure Soluble Cocoa of the Finest Quality, with the excess of fat extracted.

The Faculty pronounce it "the most nutritious, perfectly digestible beverage for Breakfast, Luncheon, or Supper, and invaluable for Invalids and Children."

Highly commended by the entire Medical Press.

Being without sugar, spice, or other admixture, it suits all palates, keeps better in all climates, and is four times the strength of cocoa-thickened yet weakened with starch, &c., and is **REALLY CHEAPER** than such Mixtures.

Made instantaneously with boiling water, a teaspoonful to a Breakfast Cup, costing less than a halfpenny.

COCATINA A LA VANILLE is the most delicate, digestible, cheap & Vanilla Chocolate, and may be taken when richer chocolate is prohibited.

In tin packets at 1s. 6d., 3s., 5s. 6d., &c., by Chemists and Grocers - Charities on Special Terms by the Sole Proprietors,
 H. SCHWEITZER & CO., 10, Adam-street, London, W.C.

MR. G. H. JONES,

SURGEON DENTIST.

57, GREAT RUSSELL-STREET, LONDON

(Opposite the British Museum).

Will be glad to forward his Pamphlet on Painless Dentistry, free enclosed by post, which explains the most unique system of the adjustment of **ARTIFICIAL TEETH** without pain.

CONSULTATION FREE FROM 10 TO 5.

THE GRAND HOTEL, TRAFALGAR SQUARE, LONDON.



Apartment may be secured from the 1st of June by letter or personal application to the Secretary's Office. The Hotel is situated in the very centre of London, close to the Houses of Parliament, and near the principal Public Buildings, Opera House, Theatres, Fine Art Galleries, and Places of Amusement, amidst conveyances to all parts of the Metropolis and the suburbs.

LAW.—WANTED, by a SOLICITOR, admitted two years, a re-engagement as Conveyancing or General Managing Clerk, country preferred, experienced in the routine of a London and a country office. Good references. Salary £150.—Address N. L., "Solicitors' Journal" Office.

LAW.—WANTED, by a SOLICITOR (articled in the country and lately admitted), a Conveyancing or General Clerkship in an office where experience may be gained.—Apply, C. J. F., 129, Gower-street, W.C.

LAW.—WANTED, by a SOLICITOR (recently admitted), thoroughly acquainted with Magisterial Practice and the general routine of a country office, an Engagement as Conveyancing Clerk under slight supervision. Salary moderate.—Address ALPHA, care of Mr. Gotelee, Odham, Hants.

LAW.—WANTED, Managing Clerkship in a Pro-vincial Office where there would be a prospect of future Partnership. Advertiser could act without supervision, if desired, and is prepared to be generally useful. Capital.—Address EQUITY, "Solicitors' Journal" Office, 52, Carey-street.

A YOUNG IRISH SOLICITOR, who has practised in Ireland for four years, would be glad to re-serve his services with a good London firm. No premium to be asked for. He would be willing to devote his whole time to the service of the business.—For particulars as to salary, &c., please apply to X. X., 41, Waterloo-street, Birmingham.

£750 will be paid to any SOLICITOR or other Gentleman, as a Bonus, for financing a Building Estate near London, the advances bearing interest at £5 per cent. per annum, and being not more than £6,000 at any time, and not exceeding two-thirds of the cost price of the houses, the builders making a large improved rental. Only principals need apply.—Address FREEHOLD, care of Mr. Drysdale, No. 31, John-street, Bedford-row, W.C.

TO CAPITALISTS and SOLICITORS. —WANTED, the Advances of £200, £500, or more or less Spare Capital on good Reversionary Securities. Good Interest and other advantages.—Address B., care of Smith, Stationer, 14, Curzon-street, Chancery-lane, E.C.

COSTS Drawn and Settled on Fair Terms by a Solicitor who has had 20 years' experience in settling costs and legal accounts in offices with large practices.—Address COSTS, 117, Chancery-lane, W.C.

WANTED TO PURCHASE, to Complete a Set, Vols. 15 to 20 of the WEEKLY REPORTER.—St. de lawes: price for the whole or any single vol. to ALPAA, care of E. W. Owles, Esq., 22, Chancery-lane, W.C.

WANTED, by a Highly-Respectable Married Person, CARE of OFFICES or CHAMBERS. Thorough good Cook and House-keeper. Could cater for two or three Gentlemen. Husband employed during the day. Would sleep on the premises. Seven years' good reference. No family. Can furnish own room, if required.—B. W., 170, Upper Kenning on-lane.

OFFICE or CHAMBERS. — Third Floor, 30, Theobald's-road (late 10, King's-road), Gray's-inn, overlooking Gray's-inn-gardens. Two rooms and ante-room with sink, w.c., &c. Rent £30.—Apply to HOUSEKEEPER.

KINAHAN'S LL WHISKY.

KINAHAN'S LL WHISKY. Pure, Mild and Mellow, Delicious and most Wholesome. Universally recommended by the Profession. The Cream of Old Irish Whiskies.

KINAHAN'S LL WHISKY. Dr. Hassall says—"Soft and Mellow, Pure, well Matured, and of very excellent quality."

KINAHAN'S LL WHISKY. Gold Medal, Paris Exhibition, 1875; Dublin Exhibition, 1865, the Gold Medal. 20, Great Titchfield Street, London, W.

BRAND AND CO'S OWN SAUCE.

SOUPS, PRESERVED PROVISIONS,

POTED MEATS and YORK and GAME PIES,

ESSENCE OF BEEF, BEEF TEA,

TURTLE SOUP, and JELLY, and other

SPECIALITIES for INVALIDS.

CAUTION:—BEWARE OF IMITATIONS.

Sole Address,

11, LITTLE STANHOPE STREET, MAYFAIR, W

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 2, at the MART, Token-house-yard, at TWO, Messrs. EDWIN FOX & BOUS-FIELD will sell the following PROPERTIES:—

NEW BOND STREET.—The spacious and commanding Freehold Business Premises, 179, New Bond-street, with conspicuous shop and show rooms and private residence over, occupying a pre-eminently attractive and prominent advertising position, being nearly opposite Burlington-gardens; the ground floor is now occupied by a well-known picture dealer, and the upper part by an eminent Court milliner; the premises are let under an old lease (at a purely nominal rent), which shortly expires, and the annual value may be moderately estimated at £650 per annum.—Solicitors, Messrs. Murray, Hutchins, & Stirling, No. 11, Birch-lane, E.C.

HANOVER SQUARE.—At the Corner of George-street, a valuable Freehold Professional Residence or Town House, No. 25, Hanover-square, admirably adapted for a club, bank, or public office, family occupation, professional purposes, or for division into suites of chambers; the premises are six storeys in height, and possess the commanding double frontage of about 40ft. to Hanover-square, and 35ft. to George-street; at present let on a lease, expiring 1885, at the low rent of £350 per annum, but moderately estimated to be worth £500 per annum.—Solicitors as above.

LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS and GREAT QUEEN STREET.—In Three Lots, by order of the Committee, exceedingly valuable Freehold Estates, comprising the grand block of freehold property lately vacated by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, well known as occupying one of the finest sites in this important and improving position, consisting of No. 67, Lincoln's-inn-fields, and Nos. 76, 77, 72, and 73, Great Queen-street, covering the important superficial area of 8,300ft.; all the buildings are most substantial, and in their present form, with but a moderate outlay, are available for professional and commercial purposes, their proximity to the Law Courts points to their profitable utilization for suites of chambers, while their position equally adapts them for the printing and other kindred trades, as also for carriage builders and furniture warehouse.—Solicitors, Messrs. Bridges, Sawtell, Heywood, & Co., 23, Red Lion-square.
No. 99, Gresham-street, Bank, E.C.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 23, at the MART, Token-house-yard, at TWO, Messrs. EDWIN FOX & BOUS-FIELD will SELL, as above, the following properties:—

OLD WINDSOR.—A delightful Freehold Residence, known as The Lodge, well placed in the centre of a first-class sporting and residential district, containing ample accommodation for a large establishment, and surrounded by 17 acres of shrubberies, ornamental pleasure grounds, kitchen gardens, greenhouse, orchard-house, vinery, &c., and park-like meadow land; there are complete out-buildings, including entrance lodge, first-class stabling and coach-house, men's rooms, three cottages, laundry, dairy, &c.—Solicitors, Messrs. Brooks, Jenkins, & Co., 7, Goldsmith-street, Doctors'-commons, E.C.

OLD WINDSOR.—A pretty little Freehold Residence known as Birch-cottage, occupying a very pleasant position, near the Datchet and Windsor Stations, and a short distance from the Thames and Great Park. The house is well secluded in its own grounds, and contains six bed rooms, dressing and work rooms, three reception rooms, offices, and capital stabling, conservatory, &c. The grounds comprise about 4½ acres, and include lawn and pleasure garden, capital kitchen garden, orchard, and meadow land.

HERTFORDSHIRE.—A beautiful Freehold Residential Estate, abutting on the Great North-road by the 16th mile stone from London, 2½ miles from Potter's-bar Station, surrounded by the estates of the Marquis of Salisbury, Lord Sackville, and other large landed proprietors, known as Minwood, comprising a noble mansion, with complete apartments, and a short distance from the Cathedral and the interesting country around. The appearances are very complete, including halliif's house, superior stabling, dairy, laundry, cottages, forcing houses and pits, vinery, &c.—Solicitors, Messrs. Plummer & Fielding, Canterbury.

CANTERBURY.—The Stone-house Estate, a unique Freehold Residential Property, for occupation, comprising a substantial modern mansion, containing ample accommodation for a large establishment, beautifully placed within terraced and sloping gardens, intersected by a sheet of water of 700 feet in length, and surrounded by its own miniature domain of about 52 acres, including park-like land, commanding grand views of the Cathedral and the interesting country around. The appearances are very complete, including halliif's house, superior stabling, dairy, laundry, cottages, forcing houses and pits, vinery, &c.—Solicitors, Messrs. Plummer & Fielding, Canterbury.

STAINES, about half-a-mile from the station, on the river.—A Freehold, modern, and handsome Residence, complete in its arrangements, unusually well designed and built, containing 12 bed and dressing rooms, bath-room, &c., three reception rooms, billiard room, and complete offices. It is approached by a carriage drive, with handsome entrance lodge, and has complete stabling, cowhouse, greenhouse, coachman's house, &c. The grounds, about half an acre in extent, include lawn and pleasure gardens, walled-in kitchen garden, and fertile inclosures of meadow land.—Solicitors, Messrs. Lambert, Petch, & Shakespeare, 8 John-street, Bedford-row, W.C.

FINCHLEY.—A capital, detached Villa Residence, at Church-end, near the station, known as Greta-house, containing ample accommodation, with a good garden, half an acre in extent, in the rear; held for 90 years unexpired, at a low ground-rent, and for sale with possession.—Solicitors, Messrs. Gush & Phillips, 3, Finsbury-circus, E.C.

No. 99, Gresham-street, Bank, E.C.

oken-
BOUS.

reehold
s shop
re-emi-
nearly
ed by a
t Court,
ominal
moder-
lurray,

aluable
anover-
family
ites of
cess the
re, and
, at the
worth

T.—In
reehold
lately
, well
and im-
and Nos.
super-
and in
ble for
ie Law
mbers,
t other
ware-
& Co.,

oken-
BOUS.

own as
ng and
large
mental
-house,
te out-
coach-
icitors,
ectors'.

own as
batchet
es and
ts, and
ception
rounds
garden.

Estate,
from
y the
large
e man-
y tim-
mplese
ddings,
rwick.

reehold
stantial
large
loping
h, and
res of
if the
nances
dairy,
icitors,

er.—A
range-
dress-
m, and
hand-
green-
ere in
itchen
fessrs.
W.C.

h-end,
ommo-
; held
h pos-
ircus,